DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 917 EC 062 141

AUTHOR	Foshee, James; And Others
TITLE	A Study of the Effects on Special Programs for Exceptional Students Upon the Implementation of the Florida Finance Program. Final Report, Volume 1.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.; Florida State Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	166p.; For Volume 2, see EC 062 142
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Equal Education; *Exceptional Child Research; Financial Policy; *Financial Support; Handicapped Children; *Institutions; Interviews; Program Budgeting; Program Evaluation; Residential Schools; *School Districts; Special Classes; Special Education Teachers; *State Programs; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

Described in volumes 1 and 2 are the methodology, conclusions, and recommendations of a study to determine the impact of the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) on special programs for exceptional children in 10 school districts and on educational program development in five residential institutions. Noted are aspects of the FEFP Act (1973) such as requiring change from instructional units to full-time equivalents (FTE) as the basic revenue allocation unit for funding the 15 special programs. Discussed are the funding histories of the Department of Education (DOE) and the Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services (DHRS), and the case study methodology involving interview schedules and data report forms. Given for the 10 districts are conclusions and recommendations regarding assignment of students and teachers, identification and classification of students, initiation and deletion of special programs, and provision of programs in rural areas. Reported for the five residential institutions are advantages and disadvantages of the FTE program related to teaching staff, curriculum design, program availability, and identification and classification of students. Major results are given to indicate cautious optimism regarding improvement of school programs by FEFP, and advantages of FEFP in areas such as reduced teaching load and improved programs in institutions. Ten tables summarize responses to questions, comments, and recommendations by administrators, coordinating principals, special teachers, speech therapists, counselors, and DHRS personnel. (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091917

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS ON SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS UPON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA FINANCE PROGRAM

Final Report Volume I

Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $363.17 or $.72 per copy to inform the public of the effect of the Florida Education Finance Program upon special programs for exceptional students.

EC062141

ED 091917

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS ON SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS UPON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA FINANCE PROGRAM

Co-investigators:	Dr. James Foshee Dr. Robert Garvue Ms. Donna Newcomer
Project Associate:	Ms. Lou Thomas
Research Assistants:	Mr. Paul Borreson Ms. Sara Carter Ms. Richardine Connellee Ms. Judy Heavner Mr. Bill Kennedy Mr. Al Towns Ms. Eleanor West

A cooperative study done by the Programs of Special Education and Educational Management of the Florida State University, March, 1974.

Conducted under Contracts
with the
Florida Department of Education
and
Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Task Force was co-chaired by Dr. Landis Stetler, of the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, Department of Education, and by Ms. Nancy Erickson, of the DHRS Division of Planning and Evaluation.

The Task Force membership included the following representatives:

The Governor's Office	Dr. Marshall Harris
The Senate Education Committee	Mr. Jack Leppert
The Senate Health and Rehabilitative Services Committee	Senator Ken Myers
The House Education Committee	W. Conway, Representative
The House Health and Rehabilitative Services Committee	Mr. Barry Kutun, Representative

The Florida Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education was represented as follows:

Bureau of Planning	Mr. John Wheeler
Bureau of School Finance	Mr. Ray Bazzell
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students	Mrs. Wendy Cullar
Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education	Mr. Tom Swift

The Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services was represented as follows:

Division of Planning and Evaluation	Mr. Tom Konrad Ms. Nancy Erikson
Division of Retardation	Mr. Cliff Horst Dr. Jennifer Howse
Division of Mental Health	Dr. Harold Buell
Division of Youth Services	Mr. Jack Morgan
Division of Corrections	Mr. Bob Thomas
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation	Mr. Allen Munday
Division of Administrative Services	Mr. Ed Tempest

The Florida Department of Administration was represented by Mr. Link Jarrett.

The Department of Education Advisory Committee members were as follows:

Brevard	Ms. Nina Ransom, Director of Exceptional Child Education Mr. Scott Rose, Assistant Superintendent of Business Affairs
Charlotte	Mr. Michael Eader, Coordinator of Exceptional Child Education Mr. John Sullivan, Director of Business Services
Dade	Mr. Paul Bell, Executive Director of Instruction Mr. Warren Bishop, Budget Analyst
Hillsborough	Dr. Jack Lamb, Director of Exceptional Child Education Mr. Wayne Hull, Assistant Superintendent of Business
Jackson	Ms. Joan Gesslein, Director of Special Programs and Services Mrs. Sarah Pierce, Director of Finance

The Department of Health and Rehabilitation Advisory Committee members were as follows:

Division of Retardation	Mrs. Nell Melzer, Sunland at Marianna
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation	Mr. John T. May Alyce McPherson School, Ocala
Division of Mental Health	Mr. David Cowart Mr. John Johnson Florida State Hospital, Chattahoochee
Division of Youth Services	Mr. Richard Grimm Dozier School for Boys, Marianna
Division of Corrections	Mr. C. R. Hamitin Mr. J. B. Sexton Appalachee Correctional Institution

Consultant

Dr. Charles Forgonone	University of Florida

INTRODUCTION

The two purposes for this study were: (1) to determine the impact of the Florida Education Finance Program (F.E.F.P.) upon special programs for exceptional students in ten selected school districts, and (2) to determine the capability of F.E.F.P. to generate funds and provide a basis for program development for students in Florida's public residential institutions. The first purpose (F.E.F.P. Impact purpose) relates to the Department of Education (D.O.E.); the second purpose (F.E.F.P. Capability purpose) relates to the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (D.H.R.S.).

The report of this study is presented in two volumes. In Volume One, Chapter One describes the problems investigated, offers background information concerning past and present funding of both the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, describes the case study methodology used to investigate the problems, and explains the method of developing the case study interview schedules and data report forms. Chapter Two presents the conclusions and recommendations relating to the Department of Education F.E.F.P. Impact purpose. Chapter Three presents the conclusions and recommendations of the Health and Rehabilitative Services F.E.F.P. Capability purpose. In addition, some fiscal data provided by D.H.R.S. are presented and their implications discussed. Chapter Four contains the summary tables of the interview data presented by each position interviewed across all ten districts for D.O.E., and presented by each position interviewed across all five institutions for D.H.R.S.

Volume Two, Chapter One contains case study data presented separately for each of the ten districts interviewed. Counties are designated by letter to provide anonymity. Chapter Two includes summary tables of descriptive data relating to the specific interviews conducted in the ten districts. Chapter Three included descriptive data relating to the specific interviews conducted for each of the five D.H.R.S. institutions visited. Also included in Chapter Three are comparisons of teacher salary ranges of D.H.R.S. and selected districts. Chapter Four discusses the limitations of the study. A glossary is included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

INTRODUCTION. iv

CHAPTER ONE: Problems, Background, Methodology. 1

CHAPTER TWO: D.O.E. Conclusions and Recommendations 11

CHAPTER THREE: D.H.R.S. Conclusions and Recommendations. 21

CHAPTER FOUR: Summary Tables. 28

VOLUME TWO

CHAPTER ONE: Case Studies of Ten School Districts

CHAPTER TWO: Summary Tables of Education Program Data for Ten School Districts

CHAPTER THREE: Case Studies of Five DHRS Institutions and Comparison of DOE-DHRS Teacher Certification Levels and Salary Ranges

CHAPTER FOUR: Limitations of the Study

GLOSSARY

CHAPTER I

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS ON SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS UPON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROGRAM AND THE EFFECTS OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO ITS CAPABILITY TO GENERATE FUNDS AND PROVIDE A BASIS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOR STUDENTS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

The Department of Education Problem:

The problem was to determine the impact of the Florida Education Finance Program (F.E.F.P.) upon special programs for exceptional students in ten selected school districts.

The Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services Problem:

The problem was to determine the capability of the Florida Education Finance Program to generate funds and provide a basis for program development for students in Florida's public residential institutions.

THE FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL FINANCE ACT OF 1973 (FEFP)

The 1973 Florida Legislature passed an educational funding bill to upgrade the historic Minimum Foundation Program which is a so-called Strayer-Haig type. The Strayer-Haig model is:

$$S_i = e_i\ u_i - r^*\ v_i$$

s_i = state support for any school district

e_i = an educational program in dollar terms. Under the FEFP the base student cost times the program cost factor (weighting) would equal e. Using educable mentally retarded program as an example, $581 (base student cost) x 2.3 (program cost factor) = $1,336.30 (e).

u_i = number of units of educational need. Under the FEFP this will be full-time equivalent students. FTE= Number of students enrolled in program $\times$ $\frac{\text{Number of hours students attend program}}{\text{Number of hours per week a full-time student at that grade level attends school}}$

r^* = local qualifying rate. The * indicated a constant with each district levying the same number of mills.

v_i = assessed valuation of money exempt property in any county.

Major features of the new law are (1) a change from instructional units to full-time equivalents (FTE) as the basic revenue allocation unit; (2) substantial school district equalization; (3) weighted factor for varying costs; and (4) a comprehensive information system with school-by-school assessment and accounting. The legislature budgeted an additional $132 million increase in state funding to pay for the program.

There are four program types under FEFP with cost factors as follows:

Basic Programs	Cost Factors
Kindergarten, grades 1,2,3,	1.20
Grades 4,5,6,7,8,9,10	1.00
Grades 11 and 12	1.10
Special Programs for Exceptional Students	
Educable mentally retarded	2.30
Trainable mentally retarded	3.00
Physically handicapped	3.50
Physical and occupational therapy I	6.00
Speech therapy I	10.00
Deaf	4.00
Visually handicapped I	10.00
Visually handicapped	3.50
Emotionally disturbed I	7.50
Emotionally disturbed	3.70
Socially maladjusted	2.30
Specific learning disability I	7.50
Specific learning disability	2.30
Gifted I	3.00
Hospital and homebound I	15.00

Special Vocational-Technical Programs	Cost Factors
Vocational education I	4.26
Vocational education II	2.64
Vocational education III	2.18
Vocational education IV	1.69
Vocational education V	1.40
Vocational education VI	1.17
Special Adult General Education Programs	
Adult basic education and adult high school	1.60
Community service	1.30

As we indicated, there are fifteen special programs for exceptional students with cost factors varying from 2.3 to 15. The higher cost factors result from standards established in enabling legislation and state board regulations relative to: (1) special diagnostic procedures such as individual psychological examination by a school psychologist; (2) a pupil/teacher ratio much lower than that for regular education so as to permit more individualization of instruction; (3) special equipment and materials such as large type and braille books for the visually handicapped; and (4) ancillary services to supplement the regular or special education class programs and to maintain liaison with community agencies also providing services to the child.

Department of Education Background

Beginning with the Florida School law passed in 1941 to provide for the "physically handicapped" children and extended by an amendment passed in 1945 making provision for the mentally retarded public school student, Florida gave recognition to State responsibility in the provision of instruction and facilities for exceptional children in district school systems. When the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP) was passed in 1947, broader provisions were made for special education to meet the needs of all exceptional children in so far as practicable by permitting the establishment of special instruction units for exceptional children from State funds.

The Special Legislative Session on Education in 1968 passed legislation requiring each district school board to provide appropriate programs of special instruction by 1973-74. The Legislature provided increased funding for exceptional child instruction units as well as special funds for facilities, equipment, and teacher training to fully implement the program in five years.

After four years of the legislative thrust to serve all exceptional children by 1972-73, the status of school district programs is outlined in Table I below:

EXCEPTIONAL CHILD EDUCATION, 1972-73, STATE OF FLORIDA

Type Program	# Teachers	# Students	Waiting List
Educable Mentally Retarded	1,786	25,476	1,993
Trainable Mentally Retarded	364	3,686	354
Physically Handicapped	137	1,620	--
Hospitalized and Homebound	136½	6,647	74
Speech and Hearing	500	47,094	6,392
Deaf	144½	1,246	16
Vision	71½	909	--
Gifted	173	12,585	2,145
Emotionally Disturbed	218	3,683	1,379
Specific Learning Disability	422	8,760	3,780
Socially Maladjusted	80	1,366	56
Juvenile Shelters	61	937	--
Comprehensive	138½		
Supervisory and Special Teachers	307		
Special Service	138		
TOTALS:	4,677	114,006	16,204

The Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students requested Title V, Section 503 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funding of a contract in order to meet the requirements of the Commissioner of Education's priorities for 1973-74 and 1974-75 for Department of Education operations, namely to "improve procedure for analyzing data and for modifying policies and practices to achieve objectives." A contract was effected between the Department of Education and the Division of Universities on behalf of Florida State University to determine the impact of the Florida Education Finance Act of 1973 upon the educational program for the exceptional student in ten selected school districts, as related to: (1) assignment of students, (2) assignments of teachers, (3) identification and classification of students, (4) curriculum adjustments, (5) initiation or deletion of special programs, and (6) geographical factors.

The contractor agreed to: (1) develop a timeline for the activities to be carried out under the contract, (2) arrange for meetings of the Task Force and Advisory Committees, (3) review amd summarize the historical development of educational finance as it related to exceptional students in public schools in Florida, (4) develop case study formats and data gathering forms, (5) conduct on-site visits in ten school districts, (6) compile information, prepare a working draft of the final report and submit to the Task Force by March 14, 1974 for review, (7) consolidate and revise all comments elicited by the working draft and furnish a final report to the Department by April 15, 1974.

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services Background

Five divisions of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services provide educational programs for children, youth, and adults. The Divisions include Corrections, Mental Health, Retardation, Vocational Rehabilitation and Youth Services. All individuals served by DHRS are exceptional in the sense that they are either emotionally disturbed, retarded, socially maladjusted, or vocationally handicapped. One Division (Youth Services) serves children and youth; two Divisions (Vocational Rehabilitation and Corrections) provides services for young adults and adults; two Divisions (Retardation and Mental Health) serve children, youth, and adults.

Historically, individual institutions have submitted Legislative Budget Requests for educational programming. More recently Divisions, and subsequent to governmental reorganization, DHRS have submitted the Legislative Budget Requests. The Division of Youth Services, for a few years, operated its educational program under the funding formula (FEP) applicable to the public schools but no longer does so. No other Division has operated under an educational funding formula and all Divisions, at the present time, plan educational programs without a funding formula.

Chapter 228.051 (Florida Statutes) indicates that the "public schools of the state shall provide thirteen consecutive years of instruction beginning with kindergarten and shall also provide such instruction for exceptional children as may be required by law." In the same chapter, it is further indicated that "public schools, institutions, and agencies providing this instruction shall constitute the uniform free public schools as provided by Article IX of the state constitution..."

The Florida Education Finance Plan of 1973 did not include the institutions of DHRS as one of its features. Neither have previous state financing plans, applicable to the public schools, including the institutions of DHRS, though Chapter 228.021 (Florida Statutes) permits the State Board of Education, upon request of DHRS, to achieve as to standards. Also in the same chapter, it is indicated that "the Department of Education may provide supervisory services for the educational programs of all such (DHRS) schools or institutions."

The two chapters cited above may result in the conclusion that the rules applicable to educational programs in District schools are applicable to educational programs in institutions because both District and institutional education programs are a part of the free public schools of the state. If the conclusion is accepted then it could also be concluded that the funding of educational programs, wherever they occur, should follow the same plan and that Legislatively-mandated educational programs should be provided whether the student resides in the District or in the institution.

Whatever the merits of the statements in the preceding paragraph, representatives of DHRS feel that the educational programs of DHRS are inadequately financed. The present contract was effected to ascertain the capability of FEFP to generate funds and provide a basis for educational program development in public institutions. They recognize that the mandated thirteen years of public schooling is typically interpreted to apply to persons under the age of 21 and that other schools, courses, and classes are established at the discretion of the district school board, pursuant to law or by regulations of the state board--Ch. 228.01,(1)(a) Florida Statutes. Moreover, they recognize that present mandated educational programming, in addition to generally being interpreted to exclude profoundly mentally retarded individuals--i.e., The term "exceptional students" Ch. 228.041,(19) Florida Statutes, means any child or youth...and includes the following: the educable mentally retarded, the trainable mentally retarded....

The concern of DHRS about the adequacy of financing for its educational program is timely. Recent developments throughout the United States indicate that adequate treatment, including education, is required for institutionalized persons whatever their age and degree of handicap. Specifically, these developments are seen in recent court decisions* and in the actions of State Legislatures** in Florida and elsewhere. Obviously a court decision in a particular state is not binding on another state, yet in time it may become so. Similarly, legislation in a particular state is not binding on another state but such legislation does reveal trends or developments elsewhere. The cases of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1971), Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (1972) and Wyatt v. Stickney and the State of Alabama yield decisions which support the handicapped individual's right to education regardless of his degree of retardation. The decision in Wyatt also holds that institutionalized residents "shall have a right to...education, suited to their needs, regardless of age, degree of retardation or handicapping condition (Ennis and Friedman, p. 320)." Incarceration requires that individuals be afforded appropriate treatment, including education.

Five states (Indiana, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) have recently enacted so-called "zero reject" education laws which establish the right to education for all children (Ennis and Friedman, p. 836).

---

*See, Collins, G.D. and Singletory, E.E. Case law and education of the handicapped. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1973.

Ennis, B.J. and Friedman, P.R. Legal rights of the mentally handicapped. New York; Practicing Law Institute, 1974, 3 Vols.

Friedman, P.R. Mental retardation and the law. A report on current court cases. Washington: U.S. DHEW, April, July, October, 1973.

**See, Education Commission of the States. A summary of major state legislation passed in 1972 relating to the education of handicapped children. Denver: Author, 1973.

A wide variety of individuals reside in the institutions of DHRS. It can be argued that one cannot legislate a choice among the vast array of educational procedures for such individuals in order to assure that adequate educational programming is provided; that is, one might argue that an institutional population is so unique that a financial formula for certain specified programs would be unworkable. An educational plan for one individual might be contraindicated for another. Plaintiffs in the Wyatt v. Stickney case countered such an argument by pointing out that any habilitation (education) program required a humane physical and psychological environment, qualified staff in adequate numbers and individualized treatment plans. They argued that the Court did not have to chose a specific form of education over another but only had to assure that a number of alternatives were available from which direct services personnel can chose (See, Friedman, April, 1973, p. 8). Since the Court did set standards and established certain staff/resident ratios, it appears that plaintiffs arguments were presumed to be valid.

At the present time, persons older than twenty years and persons diagnosed as profoundly retarded are seen as falling outside the mandated programs covered by FEFP. Recent developments, court decisions, and state legislation previously described indicate the need for an adequate financing plan for educational programs in public institutions. The present contract was effected to determine whether FEFP, if expanded to include the institutions of DHRS, is capable of generating funds for adequate financing of educational programs in Florida's public residential institutions. The secretary of HRS, on behalf of the Developmental Disabilities State Planning and Advisory Council, initiated the contract to obtain a "FEFP Capability Study". A contract was effected between DHRS and the Division of Universities, Florida State University, to determine the probable impact of FEFP if it were expanded to include the institutions of HRS with respect to:

(1) teaching staff
(2) curriculum design
(3) educational assessment of students
(4) program availability
(5) identification and classification of students

The contractor agreed to:

(1) Develop a timeline for the activities to be carried out under the contract
(2) Arrange for meetings of the Task Force and Advisory Committee
(3) Review and summarize the historical development of educational finance for exceptional students in public institutions in Florida.
(4) Develop a case study format and data gathering forms
(5) Conduct on-site visits in selected HRS educational programs and to compile information (with the exception of fiscal data to be provided by the department)
(6) Prepare a working draft of the final report and submit to the Task Force for review
(7) Consolidate and revise all comments elicited by the working draft and furnish a final report to the Department by April 15, 1974.

Methodology:

The case study method was used to determine the effects of the FEFP on exceptional student programs in the ten school districts and, combined with certain fiscal data supplied by DHRS, to estimate the possible effect of FEFP upon educational programs of the DHRS institutions.

The Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students of the Florida Department of Education and The Division of Planning and Evaluation of the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services appointed a Task Force and Advisory Committee to assist in establishing goals and objectives for the study, to aid in approving data collection instruments and to review and make recommendations on the preliminary draft of the final report. The Task Force and Advisory Committees met with the research team on November 20, 1973 and December 4, 1973 to establish a set of objectives on which to base the data collection instruments. Dr. Charles Forgnone of the University of Florida served as a consultant to the research team on development of the data collection instruments. The Task Force and Advisory Committees met with the research team on December 20, 1973 to review and critique the tentative interview schedules and data collection instruments. Suggested revisions were made on the instruments, and a pilot study, using the newly revised instruments, was conducted in Taylor County. Deficiencies discovered in the interview schedules through the pilot study were corrected, and separate Department of Education interview schedules were developed for each of the following groups of positions: (1) Principals, Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Special Education Coordinators, and Finance Officers, (2) School Psychologists, Guidance Counselors, and Social Workers, (3) Exceptional Class Teachers, (4) Regular Class Teachers, (5) Speech Therapists and Itinerant Resource Teachers. In addition, each district was asked to complete data forms describing the various exceptional student programs offered within their district. Interview schedules were finalized by consultation with DHRS representatives for the following groups of positions: (1) Administrative Interview Schedules for Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Business Managers, Psychologists, and Principals, (2) Teacher Interview Schedules, and (3) Student Interview Schedules. A modified version of financial data reporting forms designed at the University of Florida for use in studying district school financial data was submitted by DHRS to all institutions in DHRS. The aim in using the university-design forms was to obtain comparable data from district and institutional educational programs. Unhappily, the aim was not realized since financial data are coded and collected differently for the institutions and the districts. Each institution attempted to complete the data forms, but the data furnished were generally incomplete and internally inconsistent. Different interpretations of the forms and of educational programs as judged by the responses given were made by the various institutions. Unfortunately, time limitations were so severe that the data forms were not returned until some time after the five site visits so that no follow-up for clarification of the data forms was possible even at the five sites.

In an effort to obtain some comparable data, DHRS representatives utilized budget documents to obtain divisional expenditure levels. Since divisions do not isolate educational expenditures, a methodology for securing missing data was developed by DHRS representatives and budget officers. Indirect costs were calculated as follows for all divisions with the exception of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation which has no indirect costs. The expenditive base for institutional administration, plant operation, and management was taken from the budget or support documents. Costs from these items were allocated to education by the percent

of total inmate time spent in educational programs. Representatives of DHRS then calculated full-time equivalent students (FTEs) by multiplying the number of pupils instructed by the number of hours of instruction per week by the number of weeks served per year. Adjustments were made to exclude instructional hours over 25 per week. Since the institutionalized student spends more than 180 days in the classroom, the calculation makes provisions for the increased number of instructional days for funding purposes. Instruction in excess of 900 hours (180 days X 5 instructional hours per day) would generate proportionately more FTEs. An institutionalized student would generate 1.25 FTEs in a 12 month period in contrast to a FTE of 1.0 for a child in the regular public school.

Computations utilizing the rationale results in an estimate that the Divisions of Corrections, Mental Health, Retardation, and Youth Services are generating a total of 8,190 FTEs for the fiscal year 1973-74. The FTEs adjusted for a 12 month program, are distributed among the following categories:

	FTE	Weighted FTE
Vocational Programs I	671	2,858
Vocational Programs II	1,940	5,122
Emotionally Disturbed	212	785
Adult Basic	3,483	5,572
Educable Retarded	371	853
Trainable Retarded	725	2,175
Socially Maladjusted	788	1,812
TOTAL	8,190	19,177

As can been seen from the data presented when the cost factors are applied, 19,177 weighted FTEs are generated. If $560 were budgeted for each of the FTEs generated, a total of $11,122,660 would be budgeted. The total contrasts with the amount reported as budgeted for the four divisions--$7,157,747. Each of the 8,190 FTE students in the four divisions is currently budgeted an average of $874 per year. If the appropriately weighted cost factors were applied, the student would generate an average of $1,358 under FEFP, according to DHRS representatives' calculations. These data were calculated from budget documents in an effort to obtain data comparable to district programs because educational expenditures are not isolated within DHRS.

School districts were notified both by telephone and letter in advance of the dates that the research team would be visiting each district. Contact persons within each district were provided with a list of the positions to be interviewed and were asked to schedule interviews with the personnel of their choice in the types of positions listed above. Principals and teachers were interviewed in their own schools, generally in the principal's office or in the guidance office. Administrative personnel were interviewed in theor own offices. All interviews were conducted on a one-to-one basis, with the exception of two assistant superintendents and two finance officers who asked to be interviewed jointly.

The research team conducted interviews for four days in Dade County, three days in Hillsborough County, two days each in Polk, Brevard, Leon, Clay and Sarasota Counties, and one day each in Hamilton, Charlotte, and Jackson Counties.

Task force members representing DHRS made initial contacts with DHRS institutions and arranged interview schedules for the research team. All interviews, with the exception of one, were conducted on a one-to-one basis. All administrative personnel were interviewed in offices; teachers and students were interviewed in the classroom.

Five institutions were visited:

(1) The Alyce McPherson School for Girls
(2) The Arthur Dozier School for Boys
(3) The Sunland Training Center at Marianna
(4) The Apalachee Correctional Institution
(5) The Florida State Hospital at Chattahoochee.

Conclusions drawn from the interviews and data collection instruments in the ten districts and the five institutions are presented in Chapters II and III.

CHAPTER 2

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The impact of the Florida Education Finance Plan on special programs for exceptional students is apparent in the following areas: (1) assignment of students, (2) assignment of teachers, (3) identification and classification of students, (4) initiation and deletion of special programs, (5) provision of programs in sparsely populated regions. There was no evidence that, to date, the Florida Education Finance Plan has made any impact on curriculum.

(1) ASSIGNMENT OF STUDENTS

1.(a) Conclusion: A definite tendency to assign exceptional students to full-time, self-contained classrooms instead of attempting to integrate them into part-time basic classroom situations when possible was reported. When assigned to a self-contained special classroom, the exceptional student retains his higher weighting for the full five hours each day. Attempts to integrate exceptional students into basic classes for art, physical education, library, and music result in loss of the higher weighting. For the period of time he remains in the basic class, he is assigned the basic class weighting. Three districts reported that the exceptional class teachers are now or may soon be responsible for teaching art, music and physical education within their own classrooms. Prior to FEFP, their exceptional students had participated in music, art, and physical education classes with basic class students under the guidance of a specialized teacher in these particular areas. 43% of regular classroom teachers indicated concern over the fact that some of the exceptional students who had been integrated into the basic classes during the previous year were now assigned to full-time special education classes. These students, in the opinion of the regular classroom teachers, did not require a full-time special education program and could benefit from part-time integration into a basic classroom situation. Florida Statutes, Chapter 230.22, states that "No student shall be segregated and taught apart from normal students until a careful study of the student's case has been made and evidence obtained which indicates that segregation would be for the student's benefit and is necessary because of difficulties involved in teaching the student in a regular class." It would appear that the tendency to assign exceptional students, who were previously integrated into basic classes, back into full-time self-contained classes is contrary to the intent of the Florida Statutes.

1.(a) Recommendations: It is imperative that school districts develop procedures and criteria for dismissal from exceptional student programs consistent with the State guidelines of the Department of Education. District and State level exceptional child administrators should monitor annually the implementation of such procedures. By statute (Florida Statute 230.23(4)(m)(6))"the principal of the school in which the student is taught shall keep a written record of the case history of each exceptional student showing the reason for the student's withdrawal from regular (basic) classes in the public school and his enrollment in or withdrawal from a special class for exceptional students, and his record shall be available for inspection by school officials at any time."

1.(b) Conclusion: A trend toward self-contained classrooms and away from resource room programming was reported by 14% of the coordinators, and 43% of the exceptional class teachers. Self-contained classrooms for the emotionally disturbed and the mentally retarded were considered appropriate by 71% of the exceptional class teachers, but these teachers felt that all other exceptionalities could best be served in a resource room setting. Of the principals interviewed, 12% reported that they had received direct pressure from "above" to retain children in full-time classes rather than place them in resource room situations. In those instances where resource room programming presently exists, the new funding is responsible for the students being assigned to the resource rooms for longer periods of time than is appropriate and for an increase in enrollment in the resource rooms.

1.(b) Recommendation: A limit should be placed upon the number of days that a student can be referred to a resource room, perhaps up to 60 half-days. In addition, the district's comprehensive plan should include provision in the staff development aspect for a three-year in-service program whereby educational strategists(similar to those being employed in the Midwest Educational Resource Center in Iowa City, Iowa) help teachers adjust to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students into the regular classroom. Students' experiences in the resource room should be short-term, diagnostic, and prescriptive.

1.(c) Conclusion: Class size has increased in all districts, although in two districts the increase was felt to be primarily due to normal growth patterns. Class size generally remained at or below the previous year's State Board of Education Regulations, however, 32% of the exceptional classroom teachers interviewed projected that class sizes will become unreasonably large unless the State Board Regulations are reinstated. 67% of the speech therapists reported that caseloads were increased greatly as a direct result of F.E.F.P. In previous years, speech therapists were able to work with one or two students at a time. With F.E.F.P., such small numbers of students are unable to generate enough funds to support a therapist, and as a result, caseloads have been increased. Of the coordinators interviewed, 27% indicated a need for definite state guidelines limiting class size. Increases in class size as a result of F.E.F.P. were denied by 31% of the superintendents who insisted that no student is placed in a special education program unless he belongs in special education. The reason given by these superintendents for increased class size was that better diagnostic and evaluation services were now available and more students could be identified. However, an increase in class size was thought to be a financially sound idea according to 29% of the superintendents interviewed, as well as 27% of the principals interviewed. It was thought to be more financially practical to assign a large number of exceptional students to one class and employ one teacher and several aides rather than assigning small numbers of students to several classes and employing several teachers at a much greater cost. 61% of the superintendents foresee an increase in the percent of total student population assigned to special education.

1.(c) Recommendation: State Board Regulation 6A-6.35 should be reinstated to assure a reasonable maximum class size for each area of exceptionality. Determination of a minimum class size is a function of the Florida Educational Finance Act of 1973 since district personnel are now aware of funds generated for each category of exceptionality and of funding requirements to support programs in each category. Persistent monitoring should be effected to ensure proper roles for teacher aides consistent with Florida Statute 231.141.

1.(d) Conclusions Due process procedures were being following for assignment of students into special education in all districts. Copies of parental notification letters were obtained in all districts. All districts appeared to be in compliance with Florida Statutes, Chapter 230.22, which states: "The parent or guardian of an exceptional student placed or denied placement in a program of special education shall be notified promptly of such placement or impending placement or denial. Such notice shall contain a statement informing the parent of guardian that he is entitled to a review of the determination and of the procedures for obtaining such a review." Staffing committees are used in all districts to determine appropriate program placement of an exceptional student. If parents refuse to allow placement of a student in special education, all districts indicated that the parent's wishes are respected.

1.(d) Recommendations: Consistent with the decision in Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1969071 (Decided by U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy, August 1, 1972), change of placement of a student should be included in a written notice by registered mail to the parent or guardian. The notice should describe proposed action in detail, and clearly state reasons. In addition, parent or guardians, should be informed of: their right to object; their child's eligibility for free services of a diagnostic center for an independent medical, psychological, and educational evaluation; their right to representation by legal counsel at a hearing; and their right to examine the child's school records (see District Procedure for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, Guidelines-1974, Volume 1, Department of Education, pp. 10-13).

(2) ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS

2.(a) Conclusions: Preliminary calculations to determine a "break-even" figure for special education classes were reported in all districts. Generally, computations included only the number of exceptional students required per class to generate a teacher's salary. 65% of the superintendents interviewed indicated that their respective districts would always hire the best qualified most highly certified and experienced teacher they could find, regardless of cost. Superintendents with more of a management-systems approach to education (19% of those interviewed) expressed a totally different philosophy, including the idea that a sound business approach to public education would dictate hiring the least expensive teacher, one who is minimally certified and who has few years of teaching experience. Because conclusive research does not exist to prove that

the level of teacher certification of years of experience have any relationship to student achievement, 18% of the Superintendents that they would recommend hiring several classroom aides rather than one expensive teacher, thereby assuring a greater amount of one to one contact. Principals, however, are responsible for hiring classroom teachers. Of the principals interviewed, 27% indicated that they would definitely look for less expensive (lower certification levels and lower years of experience) teachers to fill any vacancies next year. Only 52% of the principals assured us that money would not be a consideration in hiring classroom teachers. 15% of the coordinators indicated knowledge of instances in which too many first year, minimally certified teachers are presently being employed to fill mid-year vacancies. The trend, then, seems to be toward hiring the least expensive teacher--the one who has the lowest possible level of certification and the least possible years of experience. This trend will be a definite source of discouragement to teachers to return to college for further education in their area of speciality--if teachers increase their level of certification, they will be decreasing their chances of finding employment.
The lack of incentive to employ higher rank personnel may jeopardize some programs, particularly where the university programs are attempting to produce only masters level personnel such as speech correction, emotionally disturbed and learning disabilities. It should be kept in mind, as one superintendent pointed out, that although good teachers cost more, poor teachers cost most.

2.(a) Recommendations: One legislative goal pertaining to the Florida Educational Finance Act of 1973 was to develop unique staffing patterns. Cautious experimentation should be encouraged, and close cooperation among educational, financial, and research and development personnel at the school district level should be arranged in order that adequate monitoring will be assured. Appropriate teacher certification levels and years of experience might be adequately monitored through the mechanism of accreditation. False economy can lead to a deterioration of the educational system and must be guarded against.

2.(b) Conclusions: Concern over job security was expressed by 7% of the supervisory personnel. In view of the facts that these positions do not generate FTEs and that accreditation standards require certain positions to be maintained at the expense of others, the concern over the continued existence of these positions does not appear to be unrealistic or unwarranted.

2.(b) Recommendations: Traditional staffing patterns are not necessary to be maintained. Instructional staff at the operational (classroom) level should play a major role in the determination of the mix of resources essential for effective instruction. Central managerial, including supervisory personnel services, should be "purchased" by operational personnel. If there is no demand for such services, positions should be eliminated or central managerial personnel should be reassigned or retrained.

(C) IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

3.(a) Conclusions: An increased incentive to identify and classify students as exceptional was reported by an average of 53% of all positions in all districts. Because exceptional students generate more funds than basic classroom students, 52% of the diagnostic personnel interviewed reported receiving pressure from the principals to identify as many students as possible. The number of referrals for diagnosis and evaluation has greatly increased over the previous year's referrals, and as a result, school psychologists feel that their role is fast becoming that of a diagnostician only, leaving no time to confer with teachers or parents and no time to help teachers with educational planning or prescriptive teaching. Several temporary placements in exceptional classes were made in 70% of the districts without properly completed identification and classification diagnostic procedures, as reported by the school psychologists. 33% of the speech therapists reported that several students were added to their case loads on a temporary basis without proper diagnosis, but with diagnosis planned at a later date. In the effort to quickly identify and classify students as exceptional, it appears that many students are being placed on the membership roles of special education classes without the benefit of adequate diagnostic procedures, although these placements are only considered temporary and later diagnosis is always planned. It should be noted that even though the placement is made on a temporary basis awaiting further diagnosis, such a placement is in violation of the Florida Statutes, Chapter 230.22, which states. "No student shall be given special instruction or services until he is properly classified as an exceptional student."

3.(a) Recommendations: Since schools are to receive state benefits geared to the number of exceptional students served in special classes, such financial benefits can deflate the school's incentive to question the system's recommendation of special placement. The students in this situation clearly need an advocate and the right to a hearing to challenge the classification. Aggressive leadership on the part of the advocate must be assured.

3.(b) Conclusions: The October 2 deadline for the initial FTE count was too early in the school year to allow for adequate and careful diagnosis and evaluation of students. 13% of the exceptional class teachers and 26% of the coordinators reported that students were sometimes placed on the membership roles of special education classes on the basis of a preliminary screening only, to insure that all eligible students would be included in the October 2 FTE count.

3.(b) Recommendations: The school districts should prepare in the future to meet any administrative deadline date by providing for an on-going, continual process of referral, identification, and classification and assignment of students into the desired and/or existing special programs. Districts which lack the appropriate support personnel necessary for these tasks should reevaluate their priorities to ascertain if the services of diagnostic personnel might not be profitable to their county in the long run. November and March might be considered to be more practical dates for the count than October and February since numerous other reports are required during the first six weeks of each school year.

3.(c) Conclusions: The dates chosen for the FTE counts were considered inappropriate for the homebound programs by 50% of the districts. The counts were taken soon after the beginning of each semester. Physicians who work with homebound students set the beginning of a new semester as a target date for returning the homebound student to school; as a result, the number of homebound students is quite low when the FTE Counts are taken. Case loads quickly increase again until just prior to the next count when physicians again return homebound students to school. The homebound caseload, therefore, is much larger than it appears to be on the basis of the FTE count, and as a result, is serving many student who do not generate any funds.

3.(c) Recommendation: Homebound programs should be considered in the same manner as short-term vocational education courses for purposes of FTE counts--the count should be cumulative during the entire school year.

3.(d) Conclusions: Due to recent litigation over misplacement of non-retarded students into classes for the retarded, 37% of the coordinators expressed concern over the increased incentive from principals and administrative office personnel to assign borderline students to the highest weighted category. The problem was somewhat less of a concern in the small counties where the coordinator was able to participate in all of the staffings.

3.(d) Recommendation: Since schools are to receive state benefits dependent upon the number of students served in special classes, such financial benefits can deflate the school's incentive to question the system's recommendation of special placement. Students in this situation clearly need an advocate to guarantee their right to a hearing to challenge the classification. Staffing procedures must be closely monitored by the county coordinators of exceptional student education.

3.(e) Conclusions: Due to the increased incentive to identify students who are exceptional and the resulting increase in the number of referrals for diagnosis and evaluation, the school psychologists do not have time to re-evaluate students already in special programs. As previously stated, school psychologists have indicated that they were receiving pressure from principals to identify as many exceptional students as possible, but no school psychologist reported receiving any encouragement to re-evaluate exceptional students to determine whether the highly weighted category to which they were assigned last year was still the most appropriate placement. Moving students who may no longer need special education back into the basic program, although an educationally sound idea, has become a financially unsound idea.

3.(e) Recommendation: Within each district, educational planning should be done for each exceptional student which would serve as a basis for monitoring to ensure that the student is placed in the most appropriate classroom setting. The 1974 Guidelines for District Procedures for Providing Special Education for exceptional students outline four types of staffing: eligibility, educational planning and treatment,

articulation, and dismissal staffing. Districts are presently utilizing only eligibility staffing. It is strongly recommended that educational planning and treatment staffing, articulation staffing, and dismissal staffing be developed and utilized.

(4) INITIATION AND DELETION OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

4.(a) Conclusions: The Legislature has mandated that all exceptional students have made available to them 13 years of free public education either in a program in the district, in a multi-district program, or through contract with a non-public school. 47% of the coordinators indicated that they were receiving no support in implementing the mandatory appropriate programs for exceptional students, and they have received no encouragement to increase the number of exceptional student programs. Severely handicapped students (deaf, SED, crippled, multi-handicapped) that require a small caseload (7-9) support services and teacher aides are not generating enough funds to support their program. As a result, classes have been combined in the districts, resulting in a decrease in the number of special programs and a corresponding increase in class size.
Although districts are under mandate to provide appropriate programs for exceptional students, the funding formula as it now exists forces program rigidity. All exceptional students are being placed in some program as a result of the mandate, but the programs in many cases are not appropriate to the students' needs. Because no system of monitoring exists to insure that programs provided for the exceptional students are appropriate, concerned parents have no alternative beyond the county board but to initiate litigation.

4.(a) Recommendations: In view of the variables the exceptional student program presents, it is difficult to account for dollars generated on a school program basis. It would serve the same purpose and provide greater flexibility in the program if dollars were tracked on a district-wide basis.
It is recommended that the state of Florida provide a system of monitoring to be assured that the district school systems accept their legal responsibilities of providing appropriate educational programs for all students in the district. To assist districts in providing programs for low incidence exceptionalities, it is recommended that the weighting be increased for the deaf, crippled, severely emotionally disturbed, and multiply handicapped.

4.(b) Conclusions: Concern was expressed by all of the districts over the costs involved in initiating a new program when the number of students identified is not sufficient to generate adequate funds. When the 1968 mandatory legislation was passed with a five-year phase-in, special funds were provided to the districts for equipment and facilities. Under FEFP, no additional funds are available to encourage or to aid in the development of new programs.

4.(b) Recommendations: Whenever a case load is generated at the district level prior to March 1 of the academic year, state funds should be made available to aid in the development of a new state program.

4.(c) Conclusions: The homebound programs and the itinerant program for the visually handicapped require more than the usual amount of teacher travel time, individual materials, preparation time, and base teacher contact time. All of the homebound teachers interviewed indicated that the additional time demands limit the size of the caseload that can be served per teacher. Due to the fact that only direct pupil contact time can be counted for generating F.T.E.s, the homebound and itinerant vision programs are unable, with present weightings, to generate sufficient funds to support the program. All of the exceptional classroom teachers report that, in previous years, a portion of their time was used for individual educational assessments of children. All of the speech therapists reported that a portion of their time must be spent in screening speech and hearing problems, generating funds only on contact hours, which does not provide adequate money to continue to cover these activities.

4.(c) Recommendation: Including teacher travel time, parent and teacher contact hours and instructional material preparation time in the computation of F.T.E.s will provide more equitable and effective instructional programming. Consideration should be given to increasing the weights for the homebound and itinerant visually handicapped categories.

(5) PROVISION OF PROGRAMS IN SPARSELY POPULATED REGIONS

5.(a) Conclusions: All small school districts indicated that they were experiencing difficulty in providing programs for students with low incidence exceptionalities, such as hearing and visually handicapped, due to the fact that their district did not have enough students in these categories to generate sufficient funds to support a class. Some of the districts were cooperating with adjoining districts in providing programs for low-incidence exceptionalities, but all coordinators in these districts indicated that extreme transportation problems were inherent in multi-county programs.

5.(a) Recommendations: In spite of certain administrative and transportation difficulties, multi-county programs for varied types of exceptionality should be encouraged. Rewarding districts which have insufficient enrollment relative to the criterion of efficiency with an additional sparsity factor weighting should not be encouraged.

(6) OTHER FINDINGS

6.(a) Conclusions: Changes in job responsibility, as a result of FEFP, were reported by 12% of the finance personnel interviewed; they indicated that paperwork alone had increased 50% over previous years. One superintendent estimated that the increased record keeping would cost his district over 50 thousand dollars per year. The lack of specificity in the instructions of setting up various accounts was frustrating to the finance officers, who doubted that reports among the various districts would approach consistency. Of the principals interviewed, 16% felt that their roles had been merged with the position of the finance officer and that their role had, as a result, become similar to the role of a business manager rather than a principal. Concerns

were expressed by 15% of the principals over the amount of time professional staff were used for checking and counting FTE for the report instead of utilizing these professional staffs in their normal supervisory activities of working to improve instruction.

6.(a) Recommendation: A major legislative goal as expressed in the Florida Educational Finance Act of 1973 was the development of a more effective fiscal and educational accounting system at the district level and at the state level. A spillover effect of this movement will be the changing of roles of a number of functionaries. This will be a positive factor in the improvement of schools.
In order that school districts do not have to maintain three district accounting systems--one for each level of government (local, state, and federal)--the Department of Education should take leadership in determining the state and federal aggregate data requirements and in informing districts of these requirements by June 1, 1975.

6.(b) Conclusion: A need for additional support services for the instructional program, particularly diagnostic and educational assessment services, was indicated by 90% of the districts. Of the coordinators interviewed, 22% indicated a need for supplemental services such as casework, audiological services, development of specialized instructional material, and consultive services. The current weighting does not provide enough funds to cover these services.

6.(b) Recommendation: A mechanism for providing districts with funds for support services must be provided. Possibly, a pilot program for the development and utilization of support services in the area of exceptional student education should become a section of the transitional program category of the Florida Educational Finance Act of 1973. Perhaps eight to ten counties should be selected for assistance through a Request for Proposal (REP) and corresponding grant-type funding arrangement over a two-year experimental period.

6.(c) Conclusion: The 90% requirement is possibly the least understood portion of the FEFP. Several of the principals expressed the opinion that, if the 90% requirement is enforced, principals will be receiving all of the money that the central office has been keeping from them for years. On the other hand, 40% of the finance officers interviewed indicated that the principals would be receiving about the same amount of money under FEFP as they received under the Mininum Foundation Program; 22% of the finance officers indicated that principals would probably receive less money under FEFP than they received under MFP. The variety of opinions presented concerning the 90% requirement result from the absence of an operational definition of the 90% requirement.

6.(c) Recommendation: The 90% requirement should be waived for at least the 1974-75 fiscal year. An additional year should be sufficient for necessary deliberations concerning clarification and implementation of the concept as well as for "tooling up" relative to the fiscal and educational accounting functions.

District personnel expressed a cautious optimism about the potential of the Florida Education Finance Plan in facilitating the improvement of education in the state. Even though feelings were mixed concerning operating appropriate educational programs under the existing FEFP, the strongly expressed concensus was to keep exceptional student education under the total education funding formula. The study was basically an opinion study due to the fact that 1973-74 is a transitional period and it is too soon to determine the actual consequences of the Act. It must be kept in mind that district budgets were developed around the old Minimum Foundations Program and data is only now becoming available for researchers to make comparisons of the two funding methods. Longitudinal research should be encouraged in order that effective monitoring can be accomplished. Without such research and monitoring, the degree of state policy implementation will be an unknown.

CHAPTER 3

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether a weighted per pupil FTE formula would be capable of generating funds and providing a basis for program development for students in public institutions. Case studies of five institutions, combined with fiscal data supplied by DHRS, were used to estimate the possible effect of FEFP upon the educational programs of DHRS institutions. (Summary tables of the interviews with students, teachers, and administrators from the five institutions are presented in Chapter IV of this volume. The Vocational Rehabilitation program at one institution was examined and included in the institutional data.)

The conclusions of the investigators concerning the impact of FEFP on educational programs in DHRS residential facilities will be stated immediately. A more detailed discussion will follow. A weighted formula for educational programming is recommended because it will have a favorable effect on the institutions in that it will:
(1) emphasize written and systematic plans concerning the appropriate assignments of students to educational programs,
(2) permit "try-outs" of different educational staffing patterns, which, if instructional faculty were to play a major role, could result in more productive faculty assignments (FEFP does not require traditional staffing patterns),
(3) encourage the proper identification and classification of students because of the requirement that "no student shall be given special instruction or service until he is properly classified," (Florida Statutes, Ch. 230.22),
(4) encourage the development of comprehensive educational plans, and by the emphasis on educational objectives, encourage the development of appropriate curricula to meet the objectives,
(5) make more program options available to the residential facilities since the appropriate weights given to residential students should generate more funds which would then be available for providing more programs. In addition, applying FEFP to DHRS would encourage the development of a Departmental educational plan, a uniform definition of education, and a uniform system of educational fiscal accounting, all of which are sorely needed. Finally, FEFP may permit the establishment of educational salaries which are equitable with the salaries of Districts funded under FEFP. The specific objectives of the investigation, then (under the assumption that institutionalized persons currently eligible for education would continue to be eligible under FEFP) were to develop tentative conclusions and recommendations concerning the following five questions:

1. What would be the probable impact of FEFP on the teaching faculties of the institutions--the advantages and disadvantages?
2. What would be the probable impact of FEFP on curriculum design--the advantages and disadvantages?
3. What would be the probable impact of FEFP on the assessment of students--advantages and disadvantages?
4. What would be the probable impact of FEFP on program availability--advantages and disadvantages?
5. What would be the probable impact of FEFP on identification and classification of students--advantages and disadvantages?

The tentative conclusions and recommendations related to each question are presented below. Following the treatment of each question, other findings and a concluding statement are presented.

1. EFFECT OF FEFP ON TEACHING STAFF

A. Advantages: (1) Average class size in the five institutions range from about 5 to 25 (some class sizes are larger than 30, see Classroom Teachers' Response to DHRS Interview, item 9 in Chapter IV). The teaching loads of an indeterminate number of faculty could be reduced because more faculty could be added. The reduced teaching loads would permit the teacher to provide more individualized planning and instruction. This conclusion is based on data furnished by DHRS which indicate that during the fiscal

year, 1973-74, the institutions of DHRS are generating 19,177 FTE's. If $580 has been appropriated for each FTE generated, the amount available for education, including monies for teacher positions, would have been $11,122,660. The amount contrasts with the amount reported as available for the institutions--$7,157,747.
(2) The teachers, particularly in one institution would have less variability in the chronological ages of the students assigned to their classes. At one of the institutions visited, some classes had a chronological age range of about 35 years (ages 16-59). Programs for youth and adults should be different, which is acknowledged by FEFP in that different weights are assigned for youth and adults. The reduction in the age ranges of students would make it easier for the teacher to plan a more meaningful curriculum.
(3) The increase in funding would permit the employment of more teaching assistants. While 59 percent of the teachers currently report that they have assistants, some of the assistants are reported to be "older students" (see DHRS Teachers' Responses, items 5 and 6) interviewed did not know or did not believe that the students were receiving the type of educational program that the students needed, and 27 percent believed that some eligible students were not being provided educational programs. Increased teachers and assistants should give teachers more time to deal with the situation described.
B. Disadvantages: (1) DHRS, on the average earns more FTEs than are funded. The discrepancy between amount earned and amount funded suggests that the teachers in DHRS have large class loads. Yet in one institution visited, there are classes that are staffed on a 1 to 1 basis; these programs, however, are not year-round programs. In another institution, the teachers provided instruction for approximately 20 students for a total of 16 hours per week. It is probable that the 1 to 1 student/teacher ratio, in view of its low FTE generation, would be altered to include more students. The alteration would increase the individual teacher's load. Similarly, since the base of the FTE is 25 instructional hours, the individual teacher who currently teaches 16 hours per week would be very likely to have his(her) instructional time increased. The wide variation in class loads is probabiy a function of differences between the students in the different divisions.
(2) The teachers would, on the average, have to do more student planning and keep more individual student records. At two of the five institutions, the investigators judged individual student records and planning to be adequate. Only two of the five institutions were judged to have an adequate plan for the educational program at the institutions which seems to be related to deficit in teacher planning and record keeping.

The additional planning and record keeping(relating to the extent to which individual student objectives are attained) would increase the average work load of teachers.
C. Recommendation: (1) On the average, it seems that DHRS teachers would have their teaching loads reduced by FEFP giving them more time to plan individual educational plans for students and to assess the individual's progress more adequately. This should, in addition to reducing their hours, result in more professional satisfaction for the teacher. From the view of the teacher, therefore, FEFP would appear to be highly recommended.

2. EFFECT OF FEFP ON CURRICULUM DESIGN

A. Advantage: (1) FEFP would require that an educational plan be developed which would be an integral part of the institution. Specific program objectives and the activities for attaining the objectives would be specified. Criteria for program entry and exit would be described and adhered to. Sequential experiences compatible with the chronological and mental age of the students would be planned and conducted. All of the preceding statements are based on the assumption that if institutional educational programs were funded under FEFP that the institution would operate under similar provisions as set forth in Guidelines-1974.[1]

[1]Department of Education. District Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students. Tallahassee: Author, 1974. 2 Vols.

The existence of an overall educational plan would be of a definite advantage since at three of five institutions visited an adequate plan was not evident. Criteria for entry into a particular program while stated were not adhered to. At one institution visited, students are discharged without the knowledge of the education director; moreover, the decision to place or not to place a student into an educational program is made without input from the educational director.

The educational decisions made without educational input do not appear to be appropriate; there are simply no procedures or plans for obtaining the educational input, internally or externally. At two of the five institutions visited, the investigators were unable to obtain consistent estimates of the numbers of students that participated in the various elements of the educational program. At one visited institution, the investigators were at a loss to ascertain the objectives of the educational program elements, i.e., it was questionable that specific objectives were set, and that activities, appropriate to the chronological and mental age and sequentially presented, were provided in the elements. Again, the apparent lack of educational objectives and curriculum planning did not appear to be willful neglect; there simply were no written procedures or plans for such. In fairness, as is indicated in the DHRS Administrative questionnaire (items 1 and 2) all institutions had written plans, the investigators, however, still perceived the difficulties described above. For example, three administrators of 14 interviewed (21 percent) were unaware that written criteria for entrance into their educational programs exist; the same number are unaware that reassignment plans--into and out of their educational program--exist (items 3 and 6, DHRS Administrative questionnaire).

B. Disadvantage: (1) The respondents in each of the five institutions visited reported an extreme shortage of educational personnel. The consensus of three of the five institutions was that they provide crisis-oriented educational programs. Shortage of personnel leaves them insufficient time for planning. Continuing their present educational programs, plus the adequate identification of their populations in terms of specific criteria as required to establish weights under FEFP, would increase the workload of educational personnel. Without additional personnel to "tool up" for FEFP, the initial workload would probably be horrendous.

C. Recommendation: (1) Though the initial pressure and workload for current institutional educational personnel would be intense as they prepared for the first count required by FEFP, the long range effect on program planning and curriculum design would appear to outweigh the disadvantages of the temporarily increased workload. FEFP would apparently ultimately result in improved curricular planning for institution; therefore, FEFP is recommended because of its anticipated improvement of the curriculum of institutions.

3. EFFECT OF FEFP ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

A. Advantages: (1) If FEFP as applied to institutions requires similar procedures as set forth in Guidelines-1974, procedures for staffing students for educational placement would be outlined by each institution. Generally, the composition of the staffing committee would be described. Entry and exit behaviors for a program would be described. (2) Due process procedures would be followed if procedures similar to Guidelines-74 were followed. If a person were placed, excluded, or dismissed from an educational program, the parent-guardian-advocate would be notified and have a right to appeal the decision. (See, in this connection, the DHRS Student Responses to questions 3 and 4, Chapter IV. Also see the DHRS Administrative Responses to questions 5 and 6, Chapter IV.)

B. Disadvantages: (1)The committee approach to educational planning requires a sharing of authority. In at least one of the five institutions visited, such sharing would represent a radical change in the traditional, institutional culture. The change would undoubtedly be initially disruptive and result in disorganization. (2) Parent-guardian-advocate involvement in institutional decisions, particularly in treatment and educational decisions, has also been rare traditionally. Such involvement is time consuming and frequently frustrating to the professional.

C. Recommendation: (1) Special education has been listed as one of the ten major educational events of 1973.[2]

[2] Phi Delta Kappan (Editorial). "Special Education: A Major Event in 1973". Bloomington, Indiana: Author, April, 1974.

"Educators and government officials showed new and historic concern for the handicapped mentally retarded and other children with special education needs."(p.513)

The activities leading up to the major educational event is less than three years old. The beginning was in the summer and fall of 1971 with the court-approved consent agreement[3] in Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The agreement included the view that education is a process by which children learn to cope and function within their environment. Thus learning to feed and clothe oneself was seen as a legitimate educational activity. By September, 1972, the agreement was expanded to provide that all retarded children were to be given a public supported education. The findings were broadened in December, 1971 in Mills v. D.C. Board of Education and expanded additionally in August, 1972.[4] U.S. District Judge Joseph Waddy ordered and decreed that all children had the constitutional right to a publicly supported education regardless of handicap and that any rules of the defendant that excluded children from educational programs without a provision for adequate and immediate alternative educational services and without a prior hearing violated the class rights of due process.[5]

Presently over 35 suits are pending throughout the country regarding equal educational opportunities for the handicapped. The Wyatt v. Stickney case cited earlier also suggests that chronological age as a reason for exclusion of institutionalized persons from educational programs is not acceptable.

As noted in the introductory statements, court decisions elsewhere are not binding in Florida, neither is the legislation of other states.

Yet there is a nationwide trend to provide education for all degrees of handicap and to provide for parent-guard an-advocate input in the decision-making process. Proposed Federal legislation continues the trend. For example, the Federal House of Representatives bill, HR 13524 introduced on March 14, 1974 by Representative Steele, embodies legislation which may accelerate the trend. The adoption of FEFP would in the opinion of the investigators continue the nationwide trend in Florida's institutions. FEFP would hasten the establishment of due process procedures in Florida's institutions. Such would tend to result in more systematic and broadly representative assessment procedures; therefore, FEFP is recommended.

4. EFFECT OF FEFP ON PROGRAM AVAILABILITY

A. Advantage: (1) The availability of funds determines to a great extent the programs which are given priority (e.g., the special projects authorized by Federal 313 grants). The addition of new programs is also determined by the monies available (See the Administrative responses to questions 8, 17, and 20, Chapter IV). To the extent that FEFP would generate new funds, more programs would become available. Students would be given the opportunity to participate in program selection.(77% of the students report no choice of program selection).

B. Disadvantage: (1) Fifty-seven percent (8 of 14) of the administrators and 39 percent (16 of 41) of the teachers interviewed were opposed to being subjected to the rules of the Department of Education. They felt that the rules would restrict the flexibility of programming (See item 7, DHRS Teachers' Responses in Chapter IV). There is a fear that "1 to 1" type programming would be eliminated under FEFP. Most teachers and administrators were unsure of exactly what was included in the State Rules and Regulations.

C. Recommendation: (1) Divisional differences are conceivably so great that an "average formula" would severely penalize the educational programs of a particular Division unless funding weights appropriate to the students in the particular Division were developed. If appropriate weights are developed and if students currently eligible for educational programs would continue to be eligible under FEFP, then it appears that more funds would be generated for institutional educational programs under FEFP. If the funds generated were provided for the educational program in the institution, the investigators believe

[3] Wientraub, F.J. and Abeson, A. "New Educational Policies for the Handicapped: The Quiet Revolution." Phi Delta Kappan. Bloomington, 1973.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

that individualized, even 1 to 1 type programs would be possible on a prescriptive basis.

The possibility of reduced flexibility and elimination of certain highly individualized classes are legitimate concerns and are not taken lightly.

Being subject to the code, rules, and regulations of the State Board of Education wherein compliance would not interfere with client rehabilitation would seem to be a real advantage to the institutions of DHRS. More attention to total program planning, program entrance and exit requirements, and budgeting could result in more programs becoming available within the institution. "Trying" FEFP by the institutions of DHRS would appear to be advantageous to the institutions. If the desirability of trying is accompanied by a no-loss clause, the desirability of trying, in the opinion of the investigators becomes greater. Since it does seem to have the capability of increasing programs for the institutions, FEFP is therefore recommended.

5. EFFECT OF FEFP ON IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

A. Advantage: (1) FEFP would require a written student evaluation plan wherein entrance and exit criteria are specified. Apparently, such does not exist or is inadequately communicated at the present time (See items 3 and 6, DHRS Administrative Questionnaire). Since FEFP funding depends on adequate identification and classification, FEFP would tend to encourage identification and classification.

B. Disadvantage: (1) Unless there are clearly defined program exit and entrance criteria, a tendency to keep "high weight" children (more money!) in the institution may develop. Clearly defined entrance and exit criteria and clear statement of goals as required be FEFP, however, should offset this potential disadvantage.

C. Recommendation: (1) FEFP emphasizes written rules and procedures for the identification and classification of students. Its implementation also requires explicit entrance, re-entrance, and exit criteria. The systematic attention to such details would appear to be of value to DHRS educational programs. For this reason, FEFP is recommended.

6. OTHER FINDINGS

(1) A modified version of the financial data from the University of Florida for use in studying district school financial data was submitted to all institutions in DHRS. The aim was to compare data from district and institutional educational programs. The aim was not realized; financial data for institutions and districts are coded differently. The data that were returned were generally incomplete and inconsistent (e.g., one institution reported it had no specific budget for education; two were inconsistent in reporting the number of students in residence and in the institution; one furnished data pertaining to the number of student hours provided per week but did not furnish data concerning the number of students participating in education program elements).

(2) There is no consistent definition of education for the different institutions. Educational activities are inconsistently defined from institution to institution.

(3) The salaries for DHRS teachers and other educational personnel are not competetive with District salaries for similar personnel;(i.e. personnel with the same qualifications, experience, and job descriptions). Chart I represents the salary ranges for teachers in 18 Districts where 22 of the largest DHRS residential facilities are located. Additional data concerning other personnel are given in Chapter Three, Volume II.

CHART I. SALARY RANGES FOR TEACHERS IN DISTRICTS WHERE 22 DHRS FACILITIES ARE LOCATED[1]

	DISTRICT	RANK III[2]	RANK II[3]	DISTRICT	RANK III[2]	RANK II[3]
1	Alachua	759-1169	865-725	Jackson	690-900	780-990
2	Baker	770-1034	876-1139	Lee	740-1130	840-1230
3	Bradford	735-1040	840-1145	Leon	710-1101	817-1207
4	Broward	800-1432	888-1520	Marion	715-1050	778-1156
5	Dade	820-1366	719-1492	Okeechobee	750-1042	816-1108
6	Desota	700-990	760-1050	Orange	740-1221	829-1310
7	Gadsden	700-960	790-1050	Palm Beach	780-1248	874-1398
8	Gilcrest	720-1030	840-1150	Sumter	743-1150	853-1260
9	Highlands	780-1090	860-1193	Union	720-1058	820-1158

[1]FEA RESEARCH DEPARTMENT, 1973-74 SALARY RANGES: TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS. Tallahassee: Author, Oct., 1973.

[2]Division of Correction Facilities in Bradford, Desota, Highlands, Jackson, Marion, Palm Beach, Sumter and Union Counties.
Division of Mental Health Facilities in Baker, Broward, Desota and Gadsden Counties.
Division of Retardation Facilities in Alachua, Dade, Jackson, Lee, Leon and Orange Counties.
Division of Youth Services Facilities in Gilcrest, Jackson, Marion and Okeechobee Counties.

[3]Compare with a monthly salary for DHRS: Classroom Teacher I=$666-908 and Classroom Teacher I-Special Education=$699-960.

[4]Compare with a monthly salary range for DHRS: Classroom Teacher II=$736-1011 and Classroom Teacher II-Special Education=$774-1065.

An analysis of the chart shows that a DHRS Classroom Teacher I has a beginning salary of $666 per month. The beginning salary for a Rank III Teacher in all 18 Districts exceeds $666. Only one District provides a maximum range less than DHRS. The same unfavorable condition exists in the comparison when a Classroom Teacher II is compared with a Rank II teacher. All 18 districts have a higher beginning salary than does DHRS. Seventeen Districts have a higher maximum. The beginning salary for Special Education Teacher I is also exceeded by the salary of the beginning Rank III teacher in 17 of the Districts. Fifteen of the Districts have a higher maximum. The beginning salary for the Special Education II, when compared to the Rank II teacher, continues the trend. Seventeen of the beginning District salaries are greater in the comparison. Fifteen Districts have greater maximum salaries. Clearly, the institutions are at a disadvantage in recruiting educational personnel.

Information furnished the investigators was that the Department of Administration attempts to keep salaries competitive with local salaries. However, DHRS representatives report that there are long delays (up to 2 years) before increases are met, and often local salary conditions have changed before action occurs on the outdated local conditions. Moreover, even if the DOA action were more responsive, and the classified position could match local beginning salaries, the lower maximum for the classified positions remains non-competetive.

(4) The difficulty in identifying total expenditures for educational programming makes it difficult to determine the effect of the "10 percent indirect services" of FEFP on the institutional programs. A uniform accounting system, which does not exist for DHRS institutions, would clarify the effect.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a weighted per pupil FTE formula would be capable of generating funds and providing a b sis for program development for students in public institutions. Assuming that students with the characteristics of the students currently in institutional educational programs would continue to be eligible under a weighted FTE formula, the effect of FTE on five factors: teachers, curriculum, student assessment, program availability and identification, and classification of students in institutions were investigated. Case studies of five institutions, combined with fiscal data furnished by DHRS were analyzed. It was concluded that the advantages accruing to all factors far outweighed the disadvantages that might occur as a result of FEFP funding of institutional educational programs. Of the five institutions visited, the investigators judged that at least three of the educational plans were inadequate. Representatives of two of the five were also inconsistent in enumerating the number of students actually participating in program elements and representatives in one institution reported they had no identified educational budget. When educational salaries at residential facilities were compared with the salaries of the District in which the residential facility was located, the salaries of the residential facilities were found to be non-competitive. There was no uniform educational accounting system of consistency in definition of education or educational activities. FEFP would impose some order on much of the disorder, which, in the opinion of the investigators, exists in DHRS educational programming and planning. The investigators conclude, therefore, that FEFP is capable of generating funds to support educational programs in public institutions and that the programs would be greatly improved as a result. It is recommended that FEFP be utilized for funding Florida's public residential educational programs

CHAPTER 4

This chapter contains Ten Tables which summarize the responses obtained from the case studies of the educational programs of the ten districts and the five institutions. Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 contain data from the districts; Tables 8, 9, and 10 from the residential facilities. Interpretation of the data presented in the Ten Tables has been given in Chapters 3 and 4.

Table 1 represents the combined responses of all administrators from the ten districts (administrators were defined as District Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, and Finance Personnel). 49 administrators were interviewed.

Table 2 presents the combined responses of all coordinating personnel (District Coordinators, Area Coordinators, and Supervisory Personnel). 49 coordinators were interviewed.

Table 3 presents the combined responses of all principals of the ten districts. 66 principals were interviewed.

Table 4 presents the combined responses of all teachers of exceptional students from the ten districts. 111 teachers were interviewed.

Table 5 contains the data obtained from the interviews of the teachers from basic education in the ten districts. 36 teachers were interviewed.

Table 6 represents the data obtained from the speech therapists in the ten districts. 22 speech therapists were interviewed.

Table 7 presents the combined responses of support personnel from the ten districts (support personnel are defined as school psychologists, guidance counselors, and social workers). 46 support personnel were interviewed.

Table 8 combines the responses of all administrators interviewed in the five DHRS residential facilities (administrators are defined as Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Directors of Education and Training, Principals, and all other educational administrators). 14 administrators from the five residential facilities were interviewed.

Table 9 contains summaries of the responses of all teachers interviewed at the five residential facilities. 41 teachers were interviewed.

Finally, Table 10 presents the summarized responses of 38 students from 4 of the residential facilities visited. Students at the Sunland Training Center were not interviewed because the questions raised were judged to be inappropriately constructed for meaningful use with the students.

GENERAL SUMMARY

TABLE I

SUPERINTENDENTS, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS, AREA SUPERINTENDENTS, FINANCE OFFICERS
ALL COUNTIES
49 INTERVIEWED

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Did the October 2 deadline affect the identification and/or assignment of students to special education programs?	23 47%	17 35%	8 18%	1	All pupil accounting periods are unresponsive to the fluctuating pupil caseload experienced by the hospital and homebound program.
				2	Pressure to identify as quickly as possible.
				1	Put extra load on identification team.
				1	We rushed to place children in special categories with incomplete evaluations.
				2	February will always show an increase over October count.
				1	Greater attempt to get students into special education.
				4	SLD and speech were affected adversely.
				4	We had problems in establishing classes for exceptionalities new to this district.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				4	First pupil accounting should be done in November.
				3	Hospital and homebound should be able to report actual number of students over several months.
2. Have minimum and maximum class sizes been set for special education programs?	36 73%	7 14%	6 13%	1	Must operate at maximum always to generate enough monies.
				1	Minimum number should be six to eight in the case of severe problems.
				4	Set by state guidelines.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 2 continued:				5	County had to exceed the maximums to generate enough dollars.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Class size should not go below fifteen, and not more than twenty.
				1	There should be an aide for every teacher who is carrying a maximum class load.
3. Has there been or do you foresee any changes in the percentages of total student population assigned to special education?	30	15	4	12	Will increase in all areas--financially, a good idea.
	61%	31%	8%	1	Overall, felt little effect from new funding.
				1	As identification procedures become more refined, the percentage will rise.
				3	Foresee class size increasing particularly in the higher weighted categories.
				1	There will be a greater tendency to help more students now by putting them in special classes.
				1	No change
				2	There may be the tendency to enroll children merely to support the units or generate funds.
4. Was due process followed in identification, classification, and placement of students to special programs?	37	1	11		
	76%	2%	22%		

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENT	COMMENTS
5. Was a copy of the letter sent to parents to inform them that their child should be placed in a special class obtained?	26 55%	1 2%	22 43%	4	If a letter is not sent, a parent conference is held.
6. Do you think that the new funding places too much emphasis on special education?	7 14%	29 59%	13 27%	1	State mandated serving all exceptional children.
				1	The FEFP Bill should give the basic weighting factor back to the basic program, the balance being retained by special education.
				2	Should have even more emphasis.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	The FEFP should give the basic weighting factor back to the basic program, the balance being retained by special education.
7. Do you think that the weightings should be changed?	23 47%	5 10%	21 43%	1	K through 3 programs are under-weighted.
				1	Basic program is under-weighted--special education is over-weighted
				1	Weightings do not correspond to actual costs, but too early to have actual figures.
				1	Favor more funds for special educators.
				1	EMR weighting discourages mainstreaming.
				1	Too soon to evaluate equitability of weightings.
				1	The basic program weighting needs more study.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 7 continued:				1	Need three years of study to determine equitability of weightings
				1	Weightings or cost factors need to be re-evaluated annually.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Increase weightings to reduce pupil/teacher ratio.
				1	Recommend 3.70 weighting for ED.
				2	Homebound must be increased.
				1	Increase weighting for basic programs.
				3	Visual I should be increased.
				2	Weighting adequate only if carried throughout the day. Even if child is resourced, he is still handicapped.
				5	Weighting should be continually reviewed.
				3	Weightings for itinerant teachers should be increased due to necessary travel time.
8. Have you determined the required number of students at each weighting to "break even" for a class?	18 37%	16 33%	15 30%	1	During peak pupil accounting periods, we can justify ourselves.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				3	Weightings should include money for support personnel.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
9. Are there any special programs which could be added, deleted, or combined?	20 41%	16 37%	11 22%	1	Low incidence of some exceptionalities in rural counties will force some of them to combine.
				2	We are going to be pushed into cutting county level consultant services, as they are not generating any F.T.E.'s.
				2	Criteria for the gifted is too low as present state guidelines permit the inclusion of bright normal children in the gifted class.
				2	May lose gifted units to accommodate other exceptionalities.
				1	Principal would rather free teachers in each of four or five disciplines for one period each day and be made available to work individually with gifted children.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Prevention type programs should be added.
				1	Program for neurologically impaired should be added.
				1	Full time gifted program should be added.
				1	Program needs to be added for borderline student.
				1	A program needs to be added in vocational education for the handicapped.
10. Will the new funding encourage you to contract for support services?	11 22%	29 59%	9 19%	3	Contract for additional diagnostic services so we can find more exceptional children.
				1	It will encourage us to contract for services with other counties.
				1	Too early to evaluate.
				1	Crash programs at identification will discourage hiring more psychological service people.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 10 continued:				2	FEFP will neither encourage us nor discourage us from contracting for support services.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	FEFP should have provisions to accommodate support services, i.e., psychological services, guidance, and consultant services.
11. Did (or will) the 7/25ths factor affect program flexibility?	15 31%	3 6%	31 63%	2	The 7/25 factor has greatly decreased program flexibility.
				3	As a result of 7/25, we are moving toward self contained classes.
				2	It has increased flexibility of programs.
				1	During the summer program, one is not encouraged to work beyond the seven hours.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	25/25 would give total flexibility to programming child.
12. Should the 7/25 ratio be changed?	14 25%	7 14%	29 57%	2	Increased
				1	Decreased
				2	Increased to 10/25
				2	Too early to evaluate
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				2	Increase the ratio
				3	Increase the ratio to 10/25

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 12 continued:					
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Increase the ratio to 9/25
				2	Too early to evaluate its fairness and impact.
				1	Abolish the 7/25 factor.
13. Has there been any encouragement for you to increase or decrease the number of special education classes?	6 16%	11 22%	30 62%	1	Some regular teachers could handle some exceptionalities with lower class loads.
				1	Decrease the number of special education programs since it is robbing the basic program.
				1	Increase in the number of special education students due to funding.
				1	Principals want to increase the number of special education classes to generate dollars.
14. Has there been or do you expect any encouragement to alter the number of full-time and part-time special education classes?	5 10%	11 22%	33 78%	2	Increase to full time
				1	All are part-time.
15. Has there been or do you foresee any more incentive to identify and classify children as exceptional?	19 39%	19 39%	11 22%	1	Greater needs will result in greater number of exceptional children.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
16.	Has there been or do you foresee any change in attitude toward the identification and classification and/or assignment of borderline cases to special education as a result of the FEFP?	7	27	15	1	Yes, somewhat, there has been a change in attitude toward the borderline student.
		14%	55%	31%	1	There is a problem in providing for the borderline student.
17.	Have your responsibilities changed as a result of FEFP?	12	29	8	1	Area superintendent now controls allocation of teacher personnel units.
		24%	59%	17%	4	Responsibilities somewhat increased
					2	Responsibilities much increased.
					5	Paper work has increased by 50%.
18.	Have other job responsibilities changed because of the FEFP?	11	20	18	1	Finance officers are going crazy.
		22%	41%	37%	1	School psychologists serve total school population instead of just exceptional children.
					1	The principal is given more responsibility.
19.	Do you feel that the policy toward hiring and assigning teachers, teacher aides, o. para professionals has or will change as a result of FEFP?	9	32	8	1	Principals can now trade off units for aides.
		18%	65%	17%	4	There will be a move toward hiring the Rank III teacher over the Rank II and inexperienced over the experienced if left to principal.
					1	Need financial support for diagnostic services.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
20.	Has allocation of classroom supplies changed any since last year ?	12 24%	23 47%	14 29%	2 1 1 1	It has increased since last year. It has decreased since last year. Experienced an increase at county expense. The allocation of classroom supplies depends on whether one's class is breaking even or has excess funds.
21.	Has re assignment and re evaluation into and out of special classes changed as a result of the new funding?	3 6%	28 57%	18 37%		
22.	Do you feel that the 90% requirement is viable?	6 12%	8 16%	35 72%	1 3 1 1	Teacher groups are reluctant to approve or support non-direct instructional staff including psychologists, consultants, screening people for hearing and vision. Unclear as to definition of 90% rule. Ninety percent of what? If 90% goes directly to schools, it will hamper districts.

#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
1	The basic full time equivalent should be increased beyond the 300 minutes, as presently it discourages other course offerings at the high school level.

	OTHER COMMENTS
1	There is an illusion of more local control in FEFP when in fact there is less.
1	Increased record keeping is costing our district an additional $[illegible],000.00
1	The cost of living factor should be re-evaluated.
1	Construction monies must be increased.
1	Programs should be funded district by district rather than school by school.
1	The twenty-five hour F.T.E. is too rigid for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children who can only tolerate 14-15 hours per week.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
COORDINATING PERSONNEL
ALL COUNTIES
49 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 2

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Did the October 2 deadline affect the identification and/or assignment of students to special education programs?	26 53%	18 37%	5 10%	6	Pushed to identify students and thus may have missed a few.
				1	Psychologists overloaded.
				13	Children placed without full evaluation with evaluations scheduled for the future.
				1	Only adversely affected speech therapy.
				2	In speech "diagnostic therapy" was necessary to make sure the F.T.E. ccunt was high enough--then went back and screened them out and included others.
				7	Deadline caused class sizes to increase to maximums.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				2	October count should be relaxed to November.
				1	A special funding program without deadlines should be established for the hospital/homebound.
2. Have minimum and maximum class sizes been set for special education programs?	32 65%	13 27%	4 8%	13	Class size is set by guidelines, but don't have them now. Need them re-instated.
				1	Class sizes are determined by special education coordinators.
				1	Class maximums too large in speech, SLD, and ED.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
3. Has there been or do you foresee any changes in the percentages of total student population assigned to special education?	26 53%	23 47%	0 0%	1	The increase is a result of placing borderline cases and new classes.
				1	Expect an increase based on needs of the district.
				2	Funding under F.T.E. and state mandate will collectivel result in an increase.
				1	Presently in speech we are enrolling large groups of mild problems.
				1	There will be an increase in SPES due to early identification.
4. Was due process followed in identification, classification, and placement of students to special programs?	30 70%	2 4%	9 18%	1	School has conference with parents.
				1	Due process should be emphasized in entire school syste
				14	Due process is being followed precisely.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Develop more specific criteria for the identification and placement of students in exceptional child programs.
5. Was a copy of the letter sent to parents to inform them that their child should be placed in a special class obtained?	31 63%	1 2%	17 35%	18	Parents are contacted personally; a consent form must be signed by the parents in all cases.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
6. Do you think that the new funding places too much emphasis on special education?	3 6%	40 82%	6 12%	7	More special education programs and funds are needed.
				1	Too much emphasis on the gifted without proper guidelines.
				2	The new funding might emphasize special education to the detriment of regular programs.
				1	It places too much emphasis on full-time special education.
				1	It places too much emphasis on the special education child in the dollar sense.
				1	New funding places special education in proper perspective.
					Fund classes, not students.
7. Do you think that the weightings should be changed?	31 63%	7 14%	12 23%	3	Itinerant programs for low prevalence exceptionalities are being hurt. Need more money.
				3	Too early to evaluate.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Multiply handicapped should get the weighting for each handicap.
				1	Weightings should be changed for partially sighted, speech, and hearing impaired because of their itinerant nature.
				1	Each exceptional child should carry his weighting all day.
				1	Change all weightings upward.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
				#REC.	RECOMMENDATIONS
Question 7 continued:				2	The weighting for homebound must be increased.
				1	Increase the itinerant gifted teacher weightings.
				1	Add a weighting of .1 or one hour to cover travel of itinerant and resource personnel.
				1	Increase: EMR weightings: 5.7.
				1	TMR : 6.2.
				1	SLD : 5.6.
				1	Gifted : 10.0.
				1	Speech : 10.5.
				1	ED : 5.6.
				1	Soc. Mal. : 4.8.
8. Have you determined the required number of students at each weighting to "break even" for a class?	26 53%	14 29%	9 18%	1	This has been determined at the county level.
					District is presently computing these.
9. Are there any special programs which could be added, deleted, or combined?	21 43%	23 47%	5 9%	1	EMR and ED could be combined.
				2	The new formula works against new programs.
				#REC	RECOMMENDATIONS
				8	Need a program for the autistic child.
				1	Need a program for the multiply handicapped deaf.
				1	Add a program for slow learners.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
				#REC	RECOMMENDATIONS
Question 9 continued:				1	Add a preventative program for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed.
				2	Need a diagnostic program for five year olds.
				1	Need a diagnostic program for preschool deaf.
10. Will the new funding encourage you to contract for support services?	11	27	11	1	Yes, for profoundly retarded.
	22%	56%	22%	1	Support services ahould be contracted only as a last resort.
				4	We will continue to contract for psychology services.
				1	It may encourage us to contract for medical services.
11. Did (or will) the 7/25ths factor affect program flexibility?	9	7	33	4	Too early to evaluate.
	18%	15%	67%	5	Seven/twenty-fifths is very constrictive in planning for individual needs.
				1	It will encourage us to limit the summer gifted program to seven hours.
				1	The 7/25 factor required us to design the instructional program to fit the finance plan.
				7	There is generally a decrease in flexibility.
				1	The 7/25 factor encourages us to move to a self-contained classroom.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
12. Should the 7/25 ratio be changed?	22 45%	8 16%	19 39%	1	The time a teacher spends driving to or from a student's home, as well as the time he spends in preparation of individual lessons, should be counted as student membership time.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				2	10/25 would be a more equitable ratio.
				2	We should be able to lower or raise the ratio based on the needs of the individual.
				1	The ratio should be increased.
13. Has there been any encouragement for you to increase or decrease the number of special education classes?	23 47%	11 22%	14 31%	1	We have placed behavior problem children with ED's to generate additional funds as well as revising schedules to obtain the maximum amount of time under the 7/25 factor.
				2	There has been some encouragement to use special classes to generate funds.
				1	Increase the number of special education students to generate funds.
14. Has there been or do you expect any encouragement to alter the number of full-time and part-time special education classes?	7 14%	25 51%	17 35%	1	No, but full time is what they encourage.
				2	Generally, there is a movement toward full time classes as opposed to resourcing children due to the funding.
				1	Increase the number of full time special education classes.
				1	Moving more toward part-time.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
15. Has there been or do you foresee any more incentive to identify and classify children as exceptional?	19 39%	21 43%	9 18%	1 1 1	Yes, there is an increased incentive, but only due to the state mandate to serve all exceptional children. There is pressure from the district and area to increas special education class sizes. Yes, definitely in speech and the gifted program.
16. Has there been or do you foresee any change in attitude toward the identification and classification and/or assignment of borderline cases to special education as a result of FEFP?	18 37%	26 53%	5 10%	2	School personnel are employing the concept of adaptive behavior more now than before all the special education litigation.
17. Have your job repsonsibilities changed as a result of FEFP?	10 20%	34 69%	5 11%	1 2 1 3	F.T.E. has merged the exceptional child coordinator's position with that of the finance officers. Increase in the amount of paperwork. New law encouraged district to get into program budgeti Job insecurity--I don't generate F.T.E.'s.
18. Have other job responsibilities changed because of FEFP?	2 4%	39 80%	8 16%	1 1 1	There is more paper work and bookkeeping. Principals are more cognizant of record keeping. Teachers are teaching art, P.E.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
19. Do you feel that the policy toward hiring, and assigning teachers, teacher aides or para-professionals has or will change as a result of the funding?	11 22%	31 63%	7 15%	5	Rank III, unexperienced teachers will be hired over experienced higher ranked teachers simply as a budgetary move.
				7	Yes, its already happened to fill mid-year vacancies.
				2	Too early to evaluate.
				1	May hire more para-professionals instead of teachers.
				1	One SLD teacher was told by her principal that she will lose her job next year since she is not generating enough F.T.E.'s to support her high salary.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Need provisions for hiring and employment of para-professionals or aides.
				1	Re-evaluate state certification requirements for special education instructors.
20. Has the allocation of classroom supplies changed any since last year?	9 18%	33 67%	7 15%	1	Increase in allocation this year.
				1	Decrease in allocation this year.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	More money is needed for consumable items.
				1	More money is needed for test materials.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENT	COMMENTS
21. Has re-assignment and re-evaluation into and out of special classes changed as a result of the new funding?	25 51%	11 22%	13 27%	1 3	Re-assignment of special education students back into regular class hindered because of large basic class size. Presently, we will hold on to a child through the second pupil accounting period rather than dismiss him as we used to, immediately after the end of the semester.
22. Do you feel that the 90% requirement is viable?	0 0%	15 31%	34 69%	9 1	Unsure of interpretation. It will be extremely difficult to implement if indirect costs are not allowed. No way to implement because of difference in teacher salaries.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				2	Recommend a concrete definition of this 90% rule.
23. Other comments and recommendations				1	Under the new F.T.E. we have visibility of funding.
				1	Delete all categories and develop one uniform category under exceptional student programs at a weight of 10 or more on a $740 basic state cost per student.
				1	More consideration is needed for smaller counties.
				1	Fund exceptional child education programs under special categorical aid.
				1	Implement regional special service centers on a grant basis for smaller counties.
				1	Allow only certified staff members in a planned program to be considered for employment by a school district and eligible for FEFP/FTE funding reimbursement.
				1	Formula for local effort should include the average income plus the assessed value on tax rolls.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
PRINCIPALS
ALL COUNTIES
66 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 3

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Did the October 2 deadline affect the identification and/or assignment of students to special education programs?	19 29%	31 47%	16 24%	1 5 1	All students were not completely screened and assigned. There was pressure to identify as many as possible before the deadline. All children were not identified prior to the October deadline.
2. Have minimum and maximum class sizes been set for special education programs?	44 67%	20 30%	2 3%	1 6 1 2 2	Class size is determined by the needs of the school population. Class size limits are set at the district level. District guidelines are followed where possible. Aware of minimum/maximums, but this is only a guideline, not a law. Class sizes are on the increase.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
					Class size should be kept as small as possible. Ten students per teacher for socially maladjusted (without aide). Class size should be determined by the program and the needs of the children.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
3.	Has there been, or do you forsee, any changes in the percentages of total student population assigned to special education?	16 27%	39 59%	11 14%	10 1	Force an increase in the percentage of total student population due to early identification and F.T.E. Schools will experience an increase if they deviate from guidelines.
4.	Was due process followed in the identification, classification, and placement of students in special programs?	63 95%	0 0%	3 5%		
5.	Was a copy of the letter sent to parents to inform them that their child should be placed in a special class obtained?	44 67%	5 8%	7 25%	10	Letters not always sent, but rather a conference is held with the parents of the exceptional child.
6.	Do you thing that the new funding places too much emphasis on special education?	2 3%	60 91%	4 6%	3 1	Not enough money is spent on special education. Special education takes an inordinate amount of supervisory time in relation to the percentage of students involved.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	# COMMENTS	COMMENTS
7. Do you think the weightings should be changed?	29	20	17	1	Weightings are fair.
	46%	30%	26%	1	Increase SLD.
				1	Increase gifted.
				2	Increase ED.
				4	Increase EMR.
				2	Increase TMR.
				2	Increase K through 3 for prevention purposes.
				4	Increase deaf education weighting.
				3	Increase weighting for regular education.
				1	Something should be written in to the weighting formula to give additional flexibility to the program.
				1	Increase weighting for the homebound.
				2	Increase weighting for physically handicapped.
				1	Increase all weightings.
				1	Vocational education should be reduced in weighting.
				6	Child should carry his weighting all day.
				1	All exceptional child weightings should be increased.
				1	Weightings for vision should be increased.
				1	Provisions should be made in the weighting system for itinerant teachers who must travel.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
8. Have you determined the required number of students at each weighting to "break even" for a class?	25 38%	31 47%	10 15%	1	Yes, we have determined the "break even" point to adjust programs for generating funds and to give kids best opportunity.
				1	The county office told one principal to meet a required number.
				1	I haven't determined it, but the county office has.
				2	It hasn't been done, but I am sure it will be.
9. Are there any special programs which could be added, deleted, or combined?	26 39%	31 47%	9 14%	4	Need a special program for slow learners.
				2	Delete socially maladjusted until the state comes up with criteria.
				1	Vocational education program needed at elementary level.
				1	Need a special program for potential school drop outs.
				1	Need a program for the neurologically impaired.

#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
4	Add a slow learner category.
1	Add a full time program for the gifted.
2	Add a special program for the neurologically impaired.
1	Eliminate gifted program.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
10. Will the new funding encourage you to contract for support services?	15 22%	29 42%	23 36%	1	Each district should hire its own psychological services and not contract.
				1	Contract for support services outside of school environment for profoundly retarded.
				1	We will reduce the number of Rank II teachers to save money for contracting.
				3	Weightings are not high enough to permit us to contract for services
				1	The state needs to set up guidelines for contractual service arrangements.
				3	Psychological services will be contracted.
				1	May contract for screening, placement, staffing (medical, pediatric, and social worker).
				2	Not sure if there is any incentive to contract for services.
11. Did (or will) the 7/25ths factor affect program flexibility?	11 17%	17 26%	38 57%	2	Seven/twenty-fifths factor forces extension of periods.
				5	It is too early to evaluate.
				1	The 7/25 factor should be more flexible.
				2	The 7/25 factor increased programming flexibility.
				2	The 7/25 factor decreased programming flexibility.
				1	The 7/25 factor has forced some children to give up art, P.E., etc.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Speech therapy needs 10/2[illegible].

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
12. Should the 7/25 ratio be changed?	10	17	33	2	Increase the ratio.
	24%	36%	50%		Decrease the ratio.
					The ratio should be changed to a range.
				1	The ratio should be determined by the needs of the student.
				2	More study of the ratio is needed.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				6	The ratio should be determined by the needs of the students.
				1	The ratio should be changed by changing the instructional week to 30 hours rather than the present 25 hour instructional week.
				2	Increase the ratio from 7/25 to 10/25.
				1	Speech therapy should be changed to 10/25.
13. Has there been any encouragement for you to increase or decrease the number of special education classes?	15	41	10	4	Increase in enrollment or number of classes is solely based on need.
	23%	62%	15%	2	Yes, there have been subtle pressures to increase the numbers to the maximum class size to generate additional F.T.E.'s.
				3	No more classes; just increase class size.
14. Has there been or do you expect any encouragement to alter the number of full-time and part-time special education classes?	8	47	11	2	Encouraged to increase the number of full time classes.
	12%	71%	17%	4	We actually moved from a part time to a full time class.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
15.	Has there been or do you foresee any more incentive to identify and classify children as exceptional?	26 39%	30 45%	10 16%	1 4 1 5 1 4	Found ways to generate more funds without hurting the programs. Yes, simply to generate funds. Some principals were told to decrease the number of teachers, but keep the same number of children. Increased incentive is not because of funding. Increased incentive will operate to meet individual needs. Increased incentive to identify and classify is due to the state mandate to serve all exceptionalities.
16.	Has there been or do you foresee any change in attitude toward the identification and classification and/or assignment of borderline cases to special education as a result of the FEFP?	8 12%	44 67%	14 21%	2 3	Borderline cases are kept in the regular classroom. If the borderline is assigned to special education, he is assigned to the part-time classes.
17.	Have your responsibilities changed as a result of the FEFP?	22 33%	20 30%	24 37%	2 1 1 1 1	More reports, more financial responsibility Revising schedules More responsibility on individual school principals Pressure on principal Exceptional child people want to feel out the attitude of prospective principals.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 17 continued:				2	More night work.
				2	More district meetings must be attended.
				2	Budget conscious now.
18. Have other job responsibilities changed because of the FEFP?	10 19%	35 67%	21 40%	10 2	Teachers have more paper work. Teachers are now teaching art and P.E.
19. Do you feel that the policy toward hiring and assigning teachers, teacher aides, or para-professionals has or will change as a result of the funding?	14 27%	34 65%	24 31%	2 2 2	Has not changed yet, but will change toward hiring Rank III, inexperienced teachers. More aides hired instead of teachers. Lacking in funds for support personnel.
20. Has allocation of classroom supplies changed any since last year?	16 24%	39 59%	11 17%	7 1 1 2	Experienced an increase in allocations. Experienced a decrease in allocations. As a teacher gains more experience, each additional year her allocation will be reduced, if student load is held constant. We have experienced and increase, but unrelated to funding.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
21.	Has re-assignment and re-evaluation into and out of special classes changed as a result of the new funding?	6 10%	32 40%	24 42%	2 4 2	Due process has favorable affected this. EMR children remain in special classes longer simply to generate F.T.E.'s. Under the F.T.E. funding formula, fusing or mainstreaming creates financial hardships.
22.	Do you feel that the 90% requirement is viable?	3 5%	0 0%	63 95%	10	Ninety percent rule needs greater clarity.

#	OTHER COMMENTS
1	Some exceptional child programs will be dropped because of lack of funds.

#	RECOMMENDATIONS
2	F.T.E. reporting form should be simplified.
1	Remove the cost of living differentials.
1	All exceptional child education should be funded at the district level, rather than the school level.
1	Should offer an incentive to hire experienced, higher rank teachers.
1	State needs more specific guidelines.
1	Child should carry his own weighting all day, even though he is resourced.
2	Need a method to include county level consultants in generating F.T.E.'s.

GENERAL FUNDING
OF
EXCEPTIONAL CHILD TEACHERS
ALL COUNTIES
111 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 4

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENT	COMMENTS
1. Is the assignment of students to special education a responsibility of the same personnel position as last year.	83 75%	11 10%	12 11%	1 1 1	Fewer blacks assigned to special education. Greater numbers are expected to be identified. Principals should stay out of identification, it should remain in the hands of the psychologist.
2. Has the new funding caused any deviation from state guidelines regarding assignment of students?	22 20%	77 69%	12 11%	1 1 3 2	Pressure to take larger classes to support unit. F.T.E. will function to lower requirements. State guidelines are lower than what teachers were informed they must meet. EMR cut-off point lower than guideline.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1 2	Class size guidelines need to be reinstated. Establish standard guidelines for special education placement.
3. Were the parents or students upset over the methods used to assign children to special education programs (or has due process been followed?)?	3 6%	78 70%	30 24%		

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
4. Has the policy regarding the re-evaluation and re-assignment of students into and out of special education programs changed or do you foresee any changes as a result of the new funding?	21 19%	73 66%	17 15%	3	Assigned less freely back to regular class.
				1	More placements are available.
				1	EMR children remain in the program longer to generate funds.
				1	More children moving out of special education than into special education.
				2	Expects children to be placed without psychological screening.
5. Did the October deadline affect the identification and classification and assignment of students into special education?	26 23%	58 52%	27 25%	2	October deadline is too early.
				8	Rush to place students before the deadline.
				14	There was placement, awaiting full evaluation.
				1	Some students were missed because of deadline.
				3	Had difficulty in setting up new programs.
				1	Process for assignment is slow and laborious.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				3	Relate funding to programs, not a head count.
6. Has there been or will there be a change in the incentive to identify and classify children as exceptional?	40 36%	52 47%	19 17%	1	No change.
				2	Will not let borderline cases in as readily.
				3	Encouraged to get the classes filled up to generate dollars.
				1	Increased incentive is due to the state mandate to serve all special education children.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 6 continued:					
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				3	Contact hours outside of classroom need funding; for example, time spent screening, inservice, etc.
7. Has there been or will there be a change in attitude toward the identification and classification of borderline cases?	27 24%	49 44%	21 32%	3	Borderline students were pushed into the rooms to fill them u
				1	Too many were identified.
				1	No change
				1	Classification of the borderline student is not as likely as it used to be, however, this is not a result of the F.T.E.
8. If and when borderline cases are assigned, do you think there will be a tendency to assign them to part-time classes?	48 43%	15 14%	48 43$	8	There is a definite move toward full-time over part-time classes for EMR students, thus it has reduced flexibility in the name of the dollar.
				3	Move toward full-time classes.
				4	Depends on needs of child.
				2	Borderline cases are not assigned.
				1	More borderline part-time placements than before.
9. Has the new funding caused any change in class size?	36 32%	50 45%	25 23%	1	Need guidelines
				2	District has not set minimum-maximum class sizes.
				1	Class size has doubled this year.
				1	Too early to evaluate.
				31	Class size has increased to generate dollars.
				1	Resource room increased beyond break even point.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 9 continued:					
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Re-institute state guidelines for class sizes.
10. Is the setting of class size a responsibility of the same personnel position as last year?	67 60%	13 12%	31 28%	1 1 2 1	County coordinator does it now, teacher did it before. Yes, the state sets class size. Area office sets class size. A change is anticipated.
11. Should changes be made in the weightings?	31 28%	24 22%	56 50%	2 #	Too early to indicate if weightings should change. RECOMMENDATIONS
				4	Increase all weightings.
				2	Increase EMR.
				1	Increase TMR.
				10	Increase ED.
				3	Increase SLD.
				1	Increase SM.
				1	Increase for gifted.
				1	Increase for physically handicapped.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 11 continued:					
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				2	Increase speech therapy
				1	Increase visually handicapped.
				1	Institute a weighting for slow learners.
12. Has the allocation for classroom materials changed as a result of the new funding?	20 18%	43 39%	48 43%	3	Reduced
				5	Increased
				1	Unchanged
				4	Need funds to start new programs.
13. Do you feel that part-time resource rooms are preferable to full-time, self-contained classrooms?	32 29%	14 13%	67 58%	13	Depends on the needs of children.
				4	Abolish self-contained classes.
				3.	Both have advantages
		RECOMMENDATIONS:		1	Principals who are responsible for comprehensive planning are looking at dollars instead of children's needs.
				5	Itinerant teacher schedule is a geographic impossibility.
				4	Need consultants
				5	Need psychological services.
				4	Need funding for all types of supportive services.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS' TABLE
ALL COUNTIES
36 INTERVIEWED

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Have there been, or do you foresee, any changes in the referral procedures as a result of FEFP?	7 19%	26 72%	3 9%	1	Inflexibility of funding will cause larger classes and lessen the possibility of using special education students back into the regular classroom.
				1	Psychologists gave all first graders a coordination and auditory test.
				1	There is not enough time to identify and classify children.
				1	It seems harder to get help from the county office.
				1	Formerly had to get parental permission for referral. This is no longer necessary.
				1	More time required for evaluation.
				1	New bookkeeping procedure.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	More standardized referral procedure.
2. Do you feel that under the new funding program there are students being placed in special classrooms who could function equally as well in a regular class?	10 28%	20 56%	6 16%	1	Behavior problems especially.
				1	Behavior disorders would be better off in special education.
				1	Class sizes are too large
				2	If regular education teachers had lower class loads, they could work with some types of exceptional children.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 2 continued:					
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	SLD should be resourced totally.
				1	Need due process to protect regular teachers from parents of exceptional children who need placement but whose parents refuse placement.
3. Do you feel that as a result of FEFP some students are not being accepted for SPES?	3 14%	10 43%	10 43%	1	Lack of space and personnel.
				1	Classes are filled, but still have children that need the services of special education teachers.
				1	Borderline cases are being placed in SLD and emotionally and socially maladjusted classes.
				1	The new funding has caused larger class sizes.
				1	Programs provide for the more severely handicapped, but not for the minimally or borderline exceptionality who could profit from small amounts of time per week in an SPES class.
				1	Not enough time has passed to see the total effect of F.T.E.
				1	Borderline EMR students are not being served.

#	GENERAL COMMENTS
1	Weightings are too low.
1	Pupil-teacher ratio too high.
1	Not enough time to identify and place before the October deadline.

#	GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS
1	Remove trained deaf and blind from SPES programs.
2	Weightings should be increased in regular and special education classrooms.
1	Funding should follow the child.
1	Lower the pupil-teacher ratios.
1	Remove the 7/2[illegible] factor.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
SPEECH THERAPISTS
ALL COUNTIES
22 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 6

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Is the assignment of students to special education a responsibility of the same personnel position as last year?	16 72%	3 14%	3 14%		
2. Has the new funding caused any deviation from state guidelines regarding assignment of students?	1 5%	16 73%	5 22%	1	Now seeing larger number of students for longer periods of time.
3. Has the new funding caused, or will it cause, any change in case load?	14 64%	7 32%	1 4%	2 1 8 3	There are more students per case load. Increased case loads do not allow time for individual testin program adopting, record keeping, progress evaluations, conferences with parents and teachers. Groups are too large to be effective. No minimum or maximum caseloads set.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Caseloads should be decided by speech therapist not central office.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
4. Has there been, or do you foresee, any changes in incentive to identify and classify students to speech therapy?	13 59%	6 27%	3 14%	1	Less incentive to identify and classify since therapist is over-loaded with children.
				7	More inclined to include into therapy child whose problems might not have warranted therapy.
				3	"I'm trying to get more students; I have a quota to meet."
				1	No change, but there is a long waiting list of children who have been identified but not placed.
5. Has there been any change in your time schedule?	8 36%	7 32%	7 32%	1	There has been discussion of block scheduling.
				1	More group instruction.
				2	More structured time schedule due to required number of contact hours.
				1	F.T.E. places constraints on scheduling.
				1	Caseload has more than doubled to provide 75 contact hours per week.
					RECOMMENDATIONS
					Need more time for individual instruction.
6.. Have you seen any change in policy toward re-evaluation and re-assignment?	5 23%	12 56%	5 23%	2	No policy change, but a general feeling that children should not be dropped from speech until after survey period.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
7. Has there been any change in allocation for materials?	2 9%	15 68%	5 23%	2 2	Severe shortage of materials and textbooks. Increase in allocation for classroom materials. The therapist doesn't know anything about allocation for materials.
				#RECOMMEND	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1 1	There should be county wide funding for speech rather than school funding. Monies are needed to establish new speech therapy programs.
8. Other?				1 1 1 1 1 2	Less time for individual therapy. No time for working with the teachers. No time for hearing screening, testing, and diagnosis of speech problems. Too early to feel the full impact of the funding change. Talk only about contact hours, no longer talk of children. Quality sacrificed for quantity.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1 1 2	F.T.E. contradicts the philosphy of the itinerant personnel. Schools should have a workshop on F.T.E. Relax deadline.

QUESTION	#RECOMMENDATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Question 8 continued:	1	Seventy-five should be the maximum caseload.
	2	Change contact hour concept.
	1	Need F.T.E. time to work with parents.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
GUIDANCE COUNSELORS AND PSYCHOLOGISTS
ALL COUNTIES
46 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 7

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Has there been, or do you foresee any change in the referral process?	4 9%	38 82%	4 9%	2	Placing children in SPES on temporary basis until psychological can be obtained.
				1	Screening has changed.
				2	Experienced large increase in number of referrals.
				2	Do not have adequate psychological services.
2. Did the October deadline affect the identification or classification of students?	16 35%	17 37%	13 28%	2	Some children placed prior to assessment in an effort to generate funds.
				3	Pressure to identify before deadline from principals
				1	Increased class size
				1	Psychologists have become almost totally diagnostic.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1.	Move survey period to November
3. Are there any plans to change your employment contract dates?	6 13%	19 41%	21 46%	1	Have discussed supplement for extra hours after school or extend to eleven or twelve months--nothing definite.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	# COMMENTS	COMMENTS
4. Has FEFP caused any deviation from state or district guidelines regarding assignment of students?	2 4%	30 65%	14 31%	1 1	New funding and due process issue makes people more cognizant of guidelines and thus adherence. Have deviated from guidelines in screening SLD children.
5. Has there been, or do you foresee, any change in incentive to identify and classify children as exceptional?	24 52%	15 33%	7 15%	1 2 2 1 1 1	Pressure to have children in special ed. classes More incentive to identify. Anticipate a greater incentive although no increase yet. More classes are available F.T.E. has wrecked EMH resource room concept Made people aware of need for early identification.
6. Has there been, or do you foresee, any change in attitude toward identification and classification of borderline cases?	8 17%	30 66%	8 17%	2 2 2	Increased tendency to assign borderline cases to full-time special education. Principals tend to be inclined toward placing the borderline. Any child who is different behaviorally will become suspect for behavior disorders class.
7. Has there been, or do you foresee, a change in policy toward re-evaluation and re-assignment out of special education because of FEFP?	5 11%	35 76%	6 13%	1 1 1	Re-assignment out of special education is down 50%. Some resistance from regular classroom teachers. More concern is directed toward getting students in, not getting them out.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
8. Has there been, or do you foresee, a change in your case load because of FEFP?	4 9%	24 52%	18 39%	1 1	Case load increased because of loss of staff members. Have more administrative duties because of additional staff member.
9. Has there been, or will there be, a change in policy toward hiring and assignment of support personnel?	14 30%	12 26%	20 44%	3 1	There will be a need for additional support personnel as students are identified. F.T.E. operates against the small school who needs to hire a psychologist.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Number of support personnel should be increased.
10. Are there any programs you might add, delete or combine?	17 37%	2 4%	27 59%	1 1	Against isolationist structure of special education. Need individualized programs, not more categories.
				#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
				6	Addition of a slow learner category.
				1	Delete the varying exceptionality category.
				1	Add learning disabilities for junior high.
				2	Initiate new program for severely neurologically impaired.
				1	Add to vocational programs.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
11. Are there some weightings which should be changed?	10 22%	15 33%	21 45%	1	Primary concern now is how much money can be generated by a given student, not concerned with teacher caseload.

#RECOMMEND.	RECOMMENDATIONS
1	Increase weighting for hospital and homebound.
3	Increase weighting for EMR.
2	Decrease weighting for gifted.
2	Increase weighting for basic education, K through 3.
1	Increase weighting for ED.
1	Increase weighting for SLD.
2	Increase weighting for deaf.
1	Increase weighting for socially maladjusted
1	Increase weighting for TMR.
1	Increase weighting in vocational/technical.
1	SPES children should carry their own weighting all day.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
DHRS ADMINISTRATORS
14 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 3

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Does your institution have a comprehensive written plan for its educational program?	13 93%	1 7%	0 0%	1 2	WHO PREPARES THE PLAN? APPALACHEE: Educational supervisor Teachers, recreational and vocational people DOZIER: Teacher committees McPHERSON: School principal SUNLAND at MARIANNA: Teachers, based on Design for Daily Living FLORIDA STATE HOSPITAL: Educational team (directors of training and education and coordinators of academic and vocational programs).

#	COMMENTS
1	(FSH) Plan is for fiscal year 74-75.
1	(FSH) Education team prepares plan.
1	(FSH) Education program initiated with employment of director of training and education two years ago.
1	(FSH) The physician primarily decides who enters the educational program.
	(FSH) There is a departmental, not institutional, plan.

2. Was a copy given to interviewee?	5				

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	
3. Are the criteria for eligibility for students entering the educational program specified in writing?	11	1	2		WHAT ARE THESE CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY AND FOR IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS? (Apalachee Corrections Institution) The Reception Center at Lake Butler does the testing. They are given the GATB and GVR tests. They are grouped by academic standing. If not a high school graduate, he is enrolled twenty hours weekly in basic courses, and twenty hours in vocational courses. If he is a high school graduate, forty hours in vocational courses. (Arthur Dozier) All students go to school for at least half a day. When a boy first enters the reception and orientation cottage, he is staffed and asked what he wants to do; he is then placed in the program that best meets his needs. Work Experience Program: (1) must be a minimum of 14 years of age; (2) must be in the 7th, 8th, 9th, or 10th grade; and (3) must accept "work" as a part of the educational program. (This program is used in lieu of a vocational training program placement for students who are younger than 16). Diversified Cooperative Training Program: (1) must be 16 years old; (2) must be in either the 11th or 12th grade. (On the job training must total a minimum of 540 hours of supervised work during 180 school days). Opportunity Program: criteria include incorrigibility, truancy, runaway, family control problems, medical problems, minor law violations, under 12 years old. (Florida State Hospital) After physician referral, patient is interviewed by education staff and his records reviewed; then he is tested and placed. (Alyce McPherson) All students are put in education programs after receiving and orientation (usually one week). (Sunland at Marianna) (1) must be a resident; (2) based on individual needs assessment.

QUESTION	# RESPONSES	RESPONSE
7. What are the priority educational programs of the institution?	11	(Apalachee) Priority # 1: Vocational Priority # 2: Basic program # 3: Literacy program. (Dozier) Teacher and other faculty priority areas are: 1. Visitation 2. Professional Reading 3. College course credit 4. Subject area conferences 5. Florida Accreditation procedures 6. Reading workshop 7. Health curriculum (Standifer) 8. Use of mobile science labs 9. Behavior modification using the Token System 10. Individual B-2 Modules 11. Building curriculum materials 12. Directing student interns 13. Seminar on planning 14. Management of EMR students 15. Informal assessment of reading level. 16. Reality therapy 17. Techniques of individualized instruction 18. Working with the socially maladjusted child 19. DYS teacher workshop 20. Understanding of drug abuse 21. Coordination of school program with home life of student 22. Teaching sex education 23. Curriculum content materials available through FDOE 24. Values clarification 25. Human relations 26. Skills in use of Media Center 27. Program planning 28. Group leader training 29. Orientation of new teachers 30. Comprehensive educational planning 31. Higher order questioning skills 32. Work or vocational information 33. Diagnosing and prescribing for basic remediation 34. Planning educational field trips 35. Understanding state rules and regulation (for education and state employment) 36. Building techniques for staff evaluation 37. Effective use of audio-visual equipment and materials 38. Developing effective group procedures for classroom use. The DYS self-study evaluation resulted in the Bureau of Education naming the following areas priority areas for the 1973-74 year: 1. Professional educational staff 2. Academic instruction 3. Vocational instruction 4. Special remedial programs 5. Para-professional staff 6. Enrichment programs 7. Staff development 8. Health education 9. Media center 10. Evaluation 11. Pilot projects 12. Supervised work experience programs 13. Accreditation. (Florida State Hospital) 1. Chronological age twenty or below 2. Residents apt to eligible for immediate release 3. A program for forensic patients. 4. The rest of the population 5. Based on individual needs 6. Establish vocational training areas 7. General education (McPherson) The program is geared to the student, rather than prority program; there are priority students.

QUESTION	#RESPONSES	RESPONSE
Question 7 continued:		(Sunland) Priority programs include: basic special education and training for the school aged, and vocational training, onward bound, and speech therapy. The highest priority is the Suntown Mall. Hopes are to staff this program which needs to hire twenty additional associate instructors.
8. What is the process for establishing these priorities?	12 2 N/A	(Apalachee) Determined by need (Dozier) 1973 self study; educational needs established by teachers' process not in writing. (Florida State Hospital) Priorities determined largely by funding sources (i.e., CA less than twenty because of federal grant regulations). Director of education; informal, educational coordinators and directors get together. (McPherson) Four learning labs; prepared study kits. (Sunland) Based on individual needs.

9. Has this process been specified in writing?	YES	NO	N/A	COMMENTS
	3	5	16	(Sunland) In the philosophy
	21%	36%	43%	

10. What plans if any, are there for adding or deleting programs?	#RESPONSES	COMMENTS
	13 1 N/A	(Apalachee) Most plans for the vocational program--more structure-- more school formalized entered. Possibly an area technical school. Need more formal training. Practicing teachers are not certified. (Dozier) Auto body repair planned for 74-75. Remedial reading program. Desire remedial math. (Florida State Hospital) 1. Still in organizational phase; don't plan to delete any. Still developing plans. 2. Add a sheltered workshop for MR. 3. Expand vocational training areas. 4. Expand personal adjustment program 5. Need more personnel in each area.

QUESTION	#RESPONSES	RESPONSE
Question 10 continued:		(McPherson) No deletions. Add vocational courses for both boys and girls. Improve academic education courses. (Sunland) Expand existing programs. Multiply handicapped program.
11. Who generally initiates program changes?	13 1 N/A	(Apalachee) Educational supervisor (Dozier) Administration (from recommendations of self study, visiting committees, DYS). Teachers (Florida State Hospital) Educational team with director of training and education as leader. (McPherson) Superintendent and/or principal and teachers. (Sunland) Staff--director of education and training.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	COMMENT
12. Is there a written policy for hiring or assessing teachers and staff?	11 79%	2 14%	1 7%	(Apalachee) Have a state personnel board. Assessed annually, on a state mandated form. Have certain specifications (Dozier) Must hold Rank III certificate in Florida. DYS evaluation form used for assessment. (Florida State Hospital) None other than DHRS policies. State certification. (McPherson) At present, the staff is hired when there is a vacancy, has a college degree, and is a certified instructor. Evaluations all made by the principal, once a year. (Sunland) Must meet criteria established by Division of Retardation. No assessment tool used consistently. (Dozier) Currently attempting to devise their own form for assessment. (McPherson) There are some long term employees who need course work to update their training, as well as, inservice training.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
13. Is there a written policy for hiring aides and paraprofessionals?	8 57%	1 7%	5 36%		(Dozier) Follow state rules and regulations. (Sunland) Follow DHRS policies.
				2	(Apalachee) No aides or paraprofessionals but badly needed.
				1	(McPherson) The principal makes decisions.
					(Florida State Hospital) Only have one employed under DHRS policies.
14. Do you have an orientation program for your educational personnel?	12 86%	1 7%	1 7%		(Apalachee) Two week program, generally six sessions; at least one day with the custodian (guard). (Dozier) Three day orientation during first two weeks of employment. (Florida State Hospital) A two day orientation for all hospital employees. A one day additional program for educational personnel. (McPherson) A five day period of observation and training by supervisor staff and other faculty. Group orientation, work days; inservice training; teacher's meetings. (Sunland) Done on the job by curriculum coordinator and principal. (Florida State Hospital) No program for educational staff other than general hospital orientation. A period of a week.
15. Are inservice training or workshops held for educational personnel?		8 86%	0 0%	2 14%	(Apalachee) Three days annually over general subjects, such as math, social studies, English, general workshop, music, recreation. (Dozier) A master plan for inservice training was developed by a committee and implemented by Title I funds. Workshops for last year included: visitations, accreditation, writing behavioral objectives, prescriptive teaching, use of individual instruction, behavior modification, and instructional development. This year so far workshops have covered reality therapy, value orientation, and accreditation.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	COMMENTS
Question 15 continued:				(Florida State Hospital) 1. A variety--held every week on Fridays. 2. In vocational areas sponsored by VR. (McPherson) 1. Films, director of training program, lectures, Glasser's Reality Therapy. 2. University of Florida courses in behavioral modification curriculum. 3. Until recently, a training officer from the local college held such workshops. 4. Local community college offers some courses in technical subjects. (Sunland) Book and equipment representatives. Vision consultant; inventory development; fire prevention; behavior modification. (Apalachee) Do have professors that come here from the University of South Florida.
16. Are instructional personnel required to take outside course work to maintain their positions?	6 43%	5 36%	3 21%	(Apalachee, Dozier, McPherson, Sunland) In order to maintain certification. (Florida State Hospital) Not required. Encouraged but not required, believe all all instructional personnel are taking courses. If contracted from the public school , they must, however. (McPherson) The instructional personnel is encouraged to take refresher courses in related subjects, and, especially in child relationships.
17. In your education program, would you have any objections to being subjected to the same rules and regulations of the public schools?	8 57%	5 36%	1 7%	(Dozier) Not opposed where rules and regulations are appropriate, and are following them at present as per State Law 959.25. If it will in any way limit our flexibility then would object strongly. Doesn't want D.O.E. to tell us what to do when public schools were part of the problem. (Florida State Hospital) Welcomed;the disadvantages far outweighed by the advantages (funds). If more money, no objections. More acceptable if more like public schools. (McPherson) Because of the nature of the students and reasons for being at this school, it cannot be expected that the students will respond as in a "normal" school situation. It depends on how this type of institution would be funded; equitable, suitable funding for serving the needs of the individual should come first.

QUESTION		COMMENTS
Question 17 continued:		(Sunland) New funding program would not allow the flexibility that now exists.
18. How is your education program integrated into the total treatment programs of the institution? OR RECOMMENDATIONS:	12 (responding) 2 N/A	(Apalachee) Look at it all as being equal. Priority is based on need, trying to fill a gap in their education. (Dozier) It's one and the same. Total integration. (Florida State Hospital) Minimal integration into total program. The team structures the patient's day. Total treatment. (McPherson) The total program is group oriented; the lab teacher also conducts reality therapy sessions. There are feed back meetings every day. Well-integrated; a major element. (Sunland) Major part of total treatment program. Works in coordination with cottage life and their programs. (Florida State Hospital) A budget needs to be assigned to education and education needs more input into its formation. (McPherson) Better trained personnel.
19. What do you think needs improvement most in the education program of the institution?	13 (responding) 1 N/A	(Apalachee) Formalized vocational programs--now it is only done when the need arises. On-the-job training. (Dozier) Need more individualization. Offer more vocational programs. Need to teach kids to make value judgements to see consequences of his own behavior. Need more coordination between institution and community. (Florida State Hospital) Need a specific education budget. Need to be able to advance through state career lines (i.e., an aide with experience and training might move up into ed. tr. positions). More personnel.

QUESTION		COMMENT
Question 19 continued:		(McPherson) The education program is most inadequate to meet the needs of the students. Enrollment fluctuates constantly (175-230); more realistic attitudes and funding shoud be adopted to serve the needs of the young people assigned therein. (Sunland) Current programs need expansion. More multi-handicapped programs. Need more facility space.
20. What factors would be most helpful towards obtaining these improvements?	12 (responding) 2 N/A	(Apalachee) Operate without a budget every year. Have a team treatment concept. Need half time academic and half time vocational programs. Problems: of 33 trades taught, only 8 are of the formalized school center type. The others are classified as on-the-job. (Dozier) Need more qualified personnel. Need good liaison people between community and institution. Need funding based on ADM rather than ADA. (Florida State Hospital) Help from D.O.E. regarding meetings, developments, etc. An educational budget; more visibility. Staff and money. (McPherson) Personnel with training for this kind of institution. Weed "grandfathered" personnel or insist they update or qualify through refresher courses in this specific area or education for this institution. Increase salaries so properly trained personnel will be attracted to the institution. Reduce class sizes. Improve funding to meet classroom needs (i.e., textbooks). (Sunland) More money and personnel.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
DHRS INSTITUTIONAL INTERVIEWS
41 Classroom Teachers

TABLE 9

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	IF YES, HOW MANY?	# COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Do you have any assistants?	24 59%	14 34%	3 7%		4	Not educational aides, but on-the-ward "psychological" aides.
					1	Use older students
				OR IF YES, HOW MANY FULL TIME?	# RECOMMENDATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
				(per teacher) One in every lab or class.		
				# COMMENTS		COMMENTS
2. Is your class room size adequate?	38 93%	1 2%	2 5%	1		This varies from room to room and is also dependent on how many students there are in each cottage.
				1		But would like more storage room - new building plans.
3. Do the supplies and equipment you receive meet your instructional needs?	36 88%	4 10%	1 2%	2		Felt supplies and equipment were more than adequate.
				2		Needed unique supplies that are difficult to find.
				1		Makes a lot of homemade supplies because market lacks certain types of items.
				1		Would like some A/V equipment and typewriters.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
4.	Is there an official written curriculum for your program?	39	1	1	12	Use Ellen A. Thiel's Design for Daily Living
		96%	2%	2%	1	Range of abilities too great for a single curriculum; use individualized program
					1	Official GED course of study
					1	In progress
					1	Basic Electronic book tests include Job Sheets
5.	Do you feel that the students are receiving the type of educational program they need?	28	7	6	1	Lack vocational counseling
		68%	17%	15%	3	Situation is improving; getting closer to goal
					1	The usual stay is on the average of 4 months; little time to work with student.
					2	Gear more toward student's vocational needs
					1	Several of our children are MR- we cannot meet their needs
					3	Need reading clinicians
					1	Need remedial services in all areas
					3	Course designed for handicapped; truck farmers, horticulture etc. More flexibie way to get equipment to work local cooperation with store. Developed by way of NRC and practicality

	# RECOMMENDATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Question 5 continued	1	Longer class time; 3 periods, 45 minutes each
	1	Schedule classes in arts and crafts, music, P.E., remedial reading
	1	Need more content
	1	Need new positions; new classes to meet needs.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
6. Do you feel that all individuals in your institution in need of an education program are receiving instruction?	30 73%	9 22%	2 5%	2	Unsure, but knows the institution is making an effort to inventory all the clients.
				2	Institution does not have enough personnel nor facilities
				2	Most students are only in the classroom for 3 months each year, but may be in other types of programs.
				1	All students receive some kind of instruction
				1	The students are receiving the kind of education they need for the short period of time they are there.
				1	Some refuse program
				2	Must have physician's okay, cannot serve client who is not referred.
				2	Work program is just work--no training. Mandatory if no high SQ--to 6th grade level.

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
7. In your education program, would you have any objections to being subjected to the same rules and regulations as the public schools?	16 39%	16 39%	9 22%	4	Does not know much about school district operation
				3	Public school rules and regulations of DOE might be restrictive and would lack flexibility.
				1	Public school funding and distribution is 20 years behind
				1	Would mean inadequate space and materials
				1	Lack of academic and personal freedom
				2	Could not serve as many people as need service on one-to-one basis.
				1	Feels program is in need of state guidelines.
				1	Yes, as long as it would be relevant to the need of students placed at this institution.
				1	The public school did not work once for these children, so how will it work in a different place.
				1	Programs are individualized here, not so in public schools.
				2	Except for permissive attitude of schools, meet requirements.
			#RECOMMENDATIONS		RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	Need total treatment program, not just a school
				1	Would need different schedule tha public school.

QUESTION	SUBJECT AREAS	
8. What were the subject areas the teachers taught at the institution?	Body parts and body tools Transportation carriers Identification of foods Communication tools and use Physical education Shelter and natural environments Pastimes Concepts of language Vocational programs Outward Bound General education review All basic academic subjects	Social studies Science Math P.E. Custodial Automobile Mechanics Home Appliance Repair Math--Science Basic Principles of Math Elementary (Social Areas) English

QUESTION	AVERAGE # STUDENTS	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
9. How many students did each teacher have in his/her class?	FSMH--13.43 AD -- 9.18	5	Also has interaction groups with 5--7
	ADMP--18.67 ACI --24.54 SAM -- 4.85	1	Work with about 18 students per day (average) on a one-to-one basis (this applies to most of the teachers who work on a one-to-one basis).
		1	Shop activities extra

QUESTION	SUBJECT AREA	# OF STUDENTS	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
10. What do you feel would be the optimum number of students for teaching your subject area?	EMH	6	1	More than one causes too many distractions, but one to one has advantages and disadvantages.
	TMH	1		
	Voc. programs	3--8		
	General Ed.	25	12	Leave it as is
	Social Studies	10		
	Science	15	1	Could increase it up to 15
	Math	10		
	Math	6	3	Reduce to 5 or 6.
	Auto Mechanics	10		
	Home Appliances	10	1	Reduce the number of students to 10.
	Math-Science	20		
	Basic Math	15	2	There should be no more than 25 in a class.
	Elem. Social	15		
	English	20--25		

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
11. How is the curriculum developed? (summarize)	1	12	All adapt and use Eilen Thiel's Design for Daily Living
		11	The program is developed by the staff.
			Program basically designed by teachers for individual needs, (exception is GED which is taught for test using state adopted texts and TV programs plus individual work, as needed).
		16	Curriculum committee
		2	Workshop guides--Division of Corrections
		1	Develop lesson plans--simple to complex
		1	Teacher
		1	Teacher developed--revised '68--approved by Institution and the Division of Corrections

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
12. How do you assess whether your students have achieved the goals outlined in your curriculum?		12	Pre and post test or inventory, based on teacher observation with check list.
		3	Pre and post testing of aptitudes. Each student is tested in individual subject areas when they leave.
			Weekly quizzes and six week forms--progress filled out--check list also used.
			For GED, regular exam given when student seems ready.
			Some assessment tools are still in formative stages.
		15	Pre and post testing.
		1	Teacher observation
			Shop--day to day observations and daily record of time and progress; Monthly exam and final exam.
			Academic Areas--teacher made tests.

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
13. What do you think needs improvement most in the education program of the institution? (summarize)	1	6	More staff
		1	More staff, about 10 teachers serving 800 students on a rotating basis.
		3	More coordination (at interview time, program was lacking, and communication a principle)
		1	Different staffing patterns
		1	Better transportation for NYC people
		1	More certified and qualified personnel
		1	More A/V materials and equipment
		1	More facility space, i.e., classrooms
	2	5	Vocational programs
	1	2	Staff needs upgrading--some are very incompetent
		1	Staff relationships are at a low ebb
		5	Reading program
		6	More practical approach--meet everyday need. More personnel, (teachers meet certification and evaluation by supervisor). Crowded classes. More flexible way to obtain materials. Some for disciplinary action are withdrawn from class for 15 to 45 days.
		#RECOMMENDATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		1	Longer class periods
		1	Institute programs in arts and crafts, music, P.E., remedial reading, library programs, A/V.
		1	More time in the institution.

QUESTION	N/A	#RECOMMEND	RECOMMENDATIONS
Question 13 continued:		1	Group treatment; more carry-over with cottage reality-therapy sessions.
		1	More programs for the multi-handicapped population .
		1	Current programs need expansion
		1	More referrals from many sources
		1	Need more positive attitude towards education in the facility
		1	Expand present system
		1	More basic education needed.
		2	More specific criteria;goals and objectives for education.
		1	More programs for adults
		1	Add program for MR in forensic unit.
		#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
14. What factors would be the most helpful towards obtaining the improvements listed above?		6	Money
		1	Hard to find people who want to live in this county
		1	Nepotism law will hurt, because everyone is related.
		1	Pay an aide to transport NYC people.
	5	1	Adopt a vocational education curriculum.
	2	3	Division-wide in-service
		1	Short courses
		4	Hire reading specialists
	4	2	Money; budget, personnel and materials for Consumers Education.

GENERAL SUMMARY
of
DHRS STUDENTS*
38 INTERVIEWED

TABLE 10

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
1. Did you get to choose the class(es) that you are enrolled in?	7 18%	28 77%	2 5%	1	(Florida State Hospital) Not particular courses but general area.
2. Do you feel that the classes that you are enrolled in are helping to prepare you for later life.	31 81%	6 16%	1 3%		(Apalachee Corrections Institute) No because I've had 11th grade before, this is elementary. Hold back on what I can learn. Already a high school graduate. Give me a chance to catch up what I used to know. Picked up on reading and math better. Let's me understand life better, read better. Have to go or mess up my time for early out--on parole. Just go to class, never discuss what we're doing. Read better; spell better.
				2	(Florida State Hospital) High school education helpful in employment later.
				1	(FSH) Has already been helpful. Hope to go to college.
				#	RECOMMENDATIONS
				1	(FSH) Want easier jobs. Want more practical courses.
3. How did you get enrolled in class here?			2	12	(Apalachee) All were assigned because of testing at Lake Butler or here.
				3	(Arthur Dozier) On the basis of the charge you are assigned to a cottage; each cottage has the same classes.
				1	I was asked about my future plans and then placed here.

* Students from Sunland at Marianna were not interviewed. The questions were deemed inappropriate.

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 3 continued:		4	I took a test.
		3	Assigned
			(Florida State Hospital)
		3	Doctor referred or recommended.
		1	Do not know.
		2	Heard about it on ward and asked to be enrolled.
			(Alyce McPherson)
		1	All girls go to the same classes.
		5	Each cottage group goes to the same laboratory class; the student is allowed to decide on the other classes.
4. How were you chosen for the particular classes you are in?	14	12	(Apalachee) All assigned to present classes.
			(Florida State Hospital)
		1	Recommended by doctor, approved by educational staff.
		1	Testing
		2	Do not know.
		1	Past history.
			(McPherson)
		1	Student with hearing problem asked to be placed where she would get help; her request was honored.
		4	Except for required work,students may pick the others; sewing was picked in this instance.
		2	Same as above except typing was picked in tnis instance.

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
5. How many hours per day do you spend in class?		1	(Florida State Hospital) Not enough AVERAGE HOURS SPENT IN CLASS: Florida State Hospital-3.5 Apalachee Corrections-7 Dozier-4.08 McPherson-5.5
6. What do you do the rest of the day?		12	(Apalachee) Most students interviewed either went to free time or P.E.; they were able to choose for themselves.
			(Dozier)
		9	Group discussion
		5	Basketball
		3	Swim
		2	Read
		1	Arts and crafts
			(Florida State Hospital)
		1	Read
		2	Occupational therapy
		3	On ward--T.V., read
		1	Work
		1	Movies
		1	Church on Sundays
		1	Walking
		1	Industrial therapy

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
Question 6 continued			(McPherson)
		4	Walk around outside, shower, go to the movies, canteen, watch T.V. (Some of these activities are off campus.
		1	Group recreation
		1	Pl y cards, pool, dance, duties taken care of, i.e., laundry, clean cottages.
		1	Group recreation, watch T.V. or go to the canteen. Generally allowed to choose activities after school
			In addition, one student works off-campus.
7. What do you like about your classes?	4		(Apalachee)
		8	Just math. Keeps my mind open, lets me think. Time to catch up on things. Trv to learn what I can do. Prefer Primary I--English. Time to think, better myself. Time to think about what I'm doing. Learn more than I know now.
			(Dozier)
		2	Nothing.
		9	Reading. Work at your own pace. Teachers help us. Learn how to get along with people. Academics.
			(Florida State Hospital)
		8	Quiet; everyone's interested. Can change task if bored. Like to learn what's happening on the outside. Films. Writing stories and poetry. Teacher. New vocabulary. Not too much work.
			(McPherson)
		7	Especially likes the vocational classes, art work. Likes sewing classes. Something to do, particularly likes a typing class.
			In addition, the work and pace appear to be well liked.

QUESTION	N/A	#COMMENTS	COMMENTS
8. What don't you like about your classes?	6	6	(Apalachee) Teachers could do more than they are doing now. Only have three years to improve, if not, parole stops. Teachers do just what they like; don't take time to explain; quick to criticize. Class is too slow. Like English, but teachers aren't helping me. You can do what you like. Teachers can't get along. Students complain mostly of slow uninteresting teachers or teachers who aren't teaching.
		5	(Dozier) Doesn't understand the content. English. Math. I like them all.
		5	(Florida State Hospital) More needed. Can't get into library. More work outside of class. Would like more different classes (music, speed reading). Too many people in class.
	3	4	(McPherson) Dislike for math, repetitive. Dislike of low level classwork (4th grade) Sometimes the work is too hard, the classroom, too noisy. The teacher who does not explain things well; or who requires the student to use a text or dictionary.